THE FABVLOVS FOVNDATION OF THE POPEDOME:

OR

A FAMILIAR CONFERENCE BE-tween two friends to the truth PHILALETHES, and ORTHOLOGVS, shewing that it cannot be proued, *That Peter was ever at Rome.*

WHEREVNTO IS ADDED A CHRONOGRAPHICALL DESCRIPtion of Pauls *peregrination with* Peters *travells, and the reasons why he could not be at Rome, that so the truth in one view may more fully and easily be seene of eevery one.*

1. THES. 5. 21.

Proue all things, and hold fast that which is good.

Ἐξετάζετε πάντα, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.

AT OXFORD,

Printed by JOHN LICHFIELD, and JAMES SHORT, for WILLIAM SPIER,

An. Dom. 1619.

Printed by John Lichfield, and James Short, for William Spier,
An. Dom. 1619.

TO THE RIGHT WORSHIPFVLL and Reverend Mr Doctor GOODWIN Deane of *Christ Church, and Vicechancelour of the Vniversitie of* Oxford. *Mr Dr* PRIDEAVX *his Maiesties Professour of Divinitie, and Rector of Exeter Colledge. Mr Dr* BENEFIELD, *the* Lady Margarets *Professour of Divinitie in the same Vniversitie.*

RIGHT WORSHIPFVLL,

IT will perhaps bee said, *Duram* (Bernarde) *suscepisti provinciam*, and J confesse it; but *viâ abundè mihi per ipsam veritatis lucem monstratâ*, I hope that I haue ouercome the difficulties, and shall haue cause to reioice in the fruit answerable to my expectation. What J haue done, J need not to preface vnto you, who haue examined and allowed thereof; but whatsoever it bee, I am bold to publish it vnder your much honoured names: persons so eminent in so famous an Vniversitie, whose countenance is grace enough against all disgrace and contempt, which this my paines may be subiect vnto, and whose singular learning will be my shelter against all

the assaults of Adversaries, which may by cavelling oppose it, but never soundly confute it. I knowe you seeke not praises in this kinde to patronize other mens labours: yet being true louers of the truth, I hope I may craue your favorable respect, and good conceit of this my honest meaning; and if you pardon my presumption, and accept of my indeavour, I shall be both comforted and encouraged in my poore studies, and bee much bounden for the same.

Batcombe April. 1. 1619.

Your VVorships

in all services and due respects
to be commanded,

RICHARD BERNARD.

TO THE READER.

CHristian Reader (so I may call thee, for I know thou assumest the name of a Christian) I wish thee heerein a friendly Reader: Thou hast my labour, but how thou wilt like of it, I know not; sure I am that I haue taken the paines, whosoeuer shall reape the profit thereof. If thou shalt reade it with a spirit of pride, I must looke for contempt; if the eye of envy looke on it, the least defect shall bee enough to brand the very best of it with words of reproach; if of me thou shalt thinke basely, (though yet I be thy brother) the worke will be vnworthy of regard; but if hatred be in thine heart, then I looke, that thy tongue should be set on fire, to expresse the flames of burning malice. If already I haue tasted of such fruite, blame me not for thus speaking to thee. I haue made often tryall, and haue found still men like men; so as I haue cause to bee suspicious; yet am I not without charity to thinke there bee learned men humble, of my owne coate, in their godly iudgment not curious. Of the Papists I aske no fauour; yet doe I earnestly desire that he may see the truth; if he loue it, hee will then esteeme of my labour; but if hee care not for the truth, the Apostle telleth him, that he will giue such ouer to beleeue lyes, that they may perish. The halting Protestant can not walke vprightly towards mee, because he faultereth

in

in his course towards God; I onely expect fauour, and desire the loue of the Lords flocke; of which, if thou be one, then I pray thee (my good friend) accept my good will in this, which heere I haue vndertaken; bee not fore-stalled in iudgement: preiudice nothing, reade me without partiality, and then I giue thee good leaue to censure me. And so I bid thee friendly farewell.

* * *

April the 1.
1619.

Thine in the truth constant,
in no errour obstinate,

R.
B. B.

A SVMMARIE OF THE REASONS, PROVING PETER neuer to haue beene at Rome.

1. IF Peter hath not witnessed his going thither, neither by word, nor writing, nor by any messenger, nor left any signes or tokens of his being there.

2 If it agree not with his Apostleship to be peculiarly assigned, as a Bishop, to a place.

3 If it be against the Scripture to be such a Bishop, as our Aduersaries make him there to be.

4 If it be not agreeable to the couenant made with Saint Paul, that he should goe to the Circumcision, and Paul to the Vncircumcision.

5 If it be absolutely necessarie, that the Scripture should plainely speake of his being there (if he had beene there, and such a one as our Aduersaries affirme and teach) and yet the word of God passing it ouer altogether with silence.

6 If the Scripture doth not onely not anouch it, but affordeth many reasons against it.

7 If the first knowne Authour, which speaketh of his being there, was a silly man, full of errours, a fabulous Relater, and spake heereof without proofe, and being neither eye nor eare witnesse thereof.

8 If all that affirme it, speake onely by heare-say, and are deceiued by the first Authour.

9 If the time, when it is said he went to Rome, be most vntrue, and confuted by Scripture.

10 If his planting of the Church of Antioch be against the word, and his translation from thence to Rome, bee a very fiction.

11 If his iourneying to Rome be of no credite.

12 If no approued Authour either doth or can tell, with whom, thorow what place, or by what meanes he went thither.

13 If the end which is alleadged for his going thither be a very tale and fabulous narration.

14 If the time allowed for his being there, the space of 25 yeares, cannot possibly be true, but easily confuted by Scripture.

14 *If the storie of his death be a fable.*

15 *If the best and most approued Ancients accord not in circumstances, but are found vntrue.*

16 *If the Aduersaries (who stand for it, and hold it as an article of their Creed) yet agree not among themselues, nor be able to proue it soundly by Scripture, or any vndeniable testimonie of man, which either saw him, or heard him there.*

17 *If he was not (as the Aduersaries affirme) with* Paul *at Rome, nor at any time of* Pauls *life after his conuersion.*

18 *If many learned and godly men vpon sound reasons beleeue him not to haue beene there.*

19 *If the reasons alledged against his being there, are not to be answered soundly and conscionably without vaine cauillations.*

20 *If whatsoeuer is said for his being there may bee easily confuted by the godly and learned in simple verity, without deceit and Sophistrie.*

If all and euery particular of these (for they may not be seuered, but taking iointly together) be true; then was *Peter* neuer at Rome;

And if he neuer was there, then was hee not the Bishop of Rome, then the Pope is not Peters *successour there, then not Christs Vicar, then not the Head of the Church, then his Supremacie vsurped, his power of no force, the terrour of his Excommunications babish, his pride tyrannicall, and his proceedings Antichristian, then his yoke is to be shaken off, and all his Agents for him are to be punished, as wicked Seducers of Gods people, supplanters of the Church, troublers of our State, suppressours of regall authority, and Enemies to the Kingdome of Christ; then haue we done well, and all the Christian Churches to come from vnder that Antichrist, and then shall all Christian Kings doe well to maintaine this separation from him in the purity of the Gospell, to take that their right from him, which he hath vsurped, in their seuerall Dominions, as Christs Vicegerents on Earth, & ioyne in one to fulfill what is foretold of his destruction, and of the ruine of that Romish Babylon,* Rev. 18. and 19. *euen so. Amen.*

A FAMILIAR CONFERENCE BETWIXT TWO FAITHFVLL FRIENDS PHILALETHES and ORTHOLOGVS, to ſhew, that it cannot be prooued that PETER was euer at Rome.

P. *SIr God ſaue you.*

O. What! my friend *Philalethes*? you are very hartily welcome. What newes I pray you that you be heere ſo ſoone this morning? I ſuppoſed you had not beene come home from our deare friend *Theophilus*.

P. *I came from him yeſterday, and by the way I ouertooke my neighbour* Theologus, *and in riding along together, we fell into a diſcourſe, among other points of Poperie, firſt of* Peters *ſupremacie, and at the length, of his being at Rome: and as he denyed that fained ſupremacie, ſo alſo would hee haue perſwaded me that* Peter *was neuer at Rome: and he was ſo confident in this, that I could not reſt, (for that I euer did ſuppoſe the contrary) till I had heard your opinion therein, whom I know to haue beene ſoundly taught by that holy and learned* Theodidactus, *with whom you were (as I heare) very lately.*

O. Indeed, I came from him but the other day, and as my good hap was, I found him reaſoning on the very ſelfe-ſame matter, with one *Pſeudadoxus*, and that obſtinate Pa-

piſt *Pſeudocatholicus* ſtanding by. The point was very long in debating, the one ſtanding for antiquitie, the other for verity.

P. *Truly, I am right glad to heare of this, for I am now ſure of a full reſolution, I pray you, how concluded they?*

O. *Theodidactus*, who had beene *Theologus* his inſtructor alſo in this, ſo preſſed *Pſeudodoxus* with Scripture and reaſon, as hee forced him to yeeld, and made him openly acknowledge (to the great griefe of *Pſeudocatholicus* the Romaniſt) that *Peters* being at Rome was more vpheld in deed, by a common error, of ſuch as haue ſo ſaid and written vnder the name of Antiquitie, than by any truth of ſtory, or ſound reaſon to proue the ſame.

P. *And doe you alſo thinke ſo?*

Peter his being at Rome but a fable.

O. Yes verily: I am perſwaded that *Peters* being at Rome is a very fable, and a tale told from one to an other, without any ſoundneſſe of truth.

P. *Then haue I hitherto beene much deceiued, for I verily did beleeue that he had beene there.*

O. But let mee aske you now I pray you, vpon what good grounds were you induced ſo to thinke?

P. *To ſay the very truth, as it is, I had no other reaſon to leade me, but the common ſaying of all men, that he was there. I neuer indeed, ſearched farther into the matter, becauſe I did not doubt of the truth of the common opinion.*

How this fable hath gotten credit.

O. This fooliſh credulouſneſſe and negligent careleſneſſe to ſearch out the truth, haue onely brought this fable into credit, and haue ſet two deare friendes Antiquitie and Veritie together by the eares, and that through *Pſeudodoxus* his firſt vnadviſed receiuing and haſtie publiſhing of it for truth: and then that *Pſeudocatholicus* his ſtiffe defending of it, becauſe hee knew it to be very aduantageous to the Sea of Rome, as the maine proppe and pillar to vphold the Popes power.

The broacher and maintainer of this error.

P. *Indeed it may well be as you ſay: for if others haue done as I haue, then we haue all done amiſſe, and like vnwiſe men, truſted before we tryed. I heard it commonly told for a truth,*

that

that Peter was at Rome. I knew that many had so written; & when any made the least doubt thereof other would cry out, saying, that all, yea all Antiquitie was for it, and therefore, I rested in their opinion, as in a truth.

O. Yea, but if you had gone to *Theodidactus*, he would haue informed you, both by Scripture and reason: and hee would haue told you, that the name of Antiquitie deceiued both you and them; for there is Antiquitie of error, as well as Antiquitie of truth. This is that Antiquitie, which they indeed pretend, because in it, truth is presupposed, being the handmaide of Verity, which giueth credit and authoritie to it, as it graceth and giueth honour to Antiquitie: so as these two betwixt themselues are neuer at oddes, but will liue and dye together.

Verity & true Antiquity are neuer at ods.

P. *I perceiue then that the name of Antiquitie may deceiue a man, and make him entertaine errour for the truth.*

O. Nothing sooner, if men be not very circumspect and wary, especially such as know not this, *that Antiquitie is of no credit at all farther then veritie giueth countenance vnto it.*

The name of Antiquity is of no authority without the truth.

P. *Well, for this one point so old and ancient, and so often told ouer for a truth of so many, if it proue a fable I will be more heedie, but lesse heady to receiue opinions thrust vpon vs, vnder the name of Antiquitie so long as I doe liue.*

O. You shall in so doing doe well: for indeed, this new Romish Religion, and the Antiquitie thereof, is brought into credit by pretending Antiquitie, and by mens neglect of the truth: of which they should first enquire, before the bare name beare any sway with them, seeing wee all doe know Errour to be ancient, euen from the beginning, and that said to be old, which is but a new nouelrie, as are all the points of doctrine in Poperie, and euery superstitious practice thereof, differing from the Scripture and the Reformed Churches of Christ at this day.

P. *I knowe well that the religion of the Papists is a patcherie of mens inventions from Iudaisme, Paganisme, and hellish deuises of Antichrist, wouen in from abuse of Scripture and*

writings of the ancient vnder the shew of pietie, for the better advancement of Christian religion, as they pretend: but yet it seemeth to me strange, that Peters being at Rome should bee a fable which hath so generally beene receaued for truth, and neuer so much as once doubted of, as Cardinall Baronius *saith, till this our age.*

O. Our learned [a] *Whitakers* and [b] *Morneus* too, can tell the Cardinall the contrary. For [c] *Marsilius Patauinus* handled & discussed this point in the Emperour *Lodowicks* daies aboue 200 yeares since. Yea [d] *Bellarmine* himselfe acknowledgeth that *Iohn Wickliff*, and one *William* his master, so long since called this matter into question; & the [e] Archbishop of *Spalato*, (whom the Lord hath deliuered from the rage of that Romish Tygre) mentioneth one *Firmilianus* in the daies of S[t] *Cyprian*, who doubted whether the Bishop of Rome sate in *Peters* chaire & was his successour or no. And therefore *Baronius* speaketh vntruly in so saying.

P. *If it hath beene questioned so long since, I marvell that it hath lyen asleepe till now?*

O. Why doe you marvell? are all errours discovered at once? or hath not the Lord his owne time for every thing? It hath pleased him not so fully to make this appeare heretofore, as now, for reasons best knowne to himselfe: now hath he stirred vp many to discouer this fable. And seeing the falshood is by such lights revealed, wee are not to stand marvelling: but rather to giue God hartie thankes for so great a mercie.

P. *Haue many, say you, handled this controversie? In all my reading I confesse, I never read any of this subiect: I pray you who be they? can you name them?*

O. The first is one [a] *Velerius*, [b] *Bale*, [c] *L. Osiander*, [d] *Reneccius*, [e] *Functius*, [f] *Magdeburgenses*, & *Illiricus*, [h] *Whitakerus*, [i] *Sibrandus Lubbertus*, [k] *Polanus*, [l] *Morneus*, [m] *Willet*, [n] *Iunius*, [o] *Heluicus*, [p] *Broughton*, [q] *Kickerman*, [r] *Pareus*, who also quoteth *Molineus*, *Curio*, *Hosemianus*, and *Gallasius*. I haue also seene a discourse of this published now aboue 46 yeares agoe by one *Chr. Curlile*, so as you see, I haue many

to

Annal. Christ. 44 num. 10.
a *Lib. de pont. Rom. controu. 4. q. 3.*
b Of the Church. Ch. 8.
c In his *defensor pacis* 2. part cap. 16.
d *Lib. 2. de pont. Rom. cap. 1.*
e *Lib. 4. de Repub. Eccles. c. 1.*
a *Cont. pap. rom.*
b *Act. pont. Rom. l. 1. in præf.*
c *In Epit. cent. 1. cent.*
d *In Panoplia tom. 4.*
e *In lib. 5. com. Chron.*
f *In hist. Eccl.*
g *Contra prim. Pap.*
h *Lib. de P. Rom. cont. 4. q. 3.*
i *De Pap. Rom. lib. 4.*
k *In Syllog. thesium Theologicorum.*
l Of the chur. chap. 8.
m *In Synop. papis. on Rom. c. 16*
n *Resp. ad Bell.*
o *In Chronol.*
p On Revel.
q *In System. Logici plenioris parte* 2.
r On Rom. cap. 16.

to consult withall in this point.

P. *I am right glad to heare of these, and that you are not alone herein: for though you* (Orthologus) *doe speake the truth, and doe alleage reasons for that you shall set downe: yet will men (you knowe such is their folly and vanitie) rather take the bare words of some, then the force of reasons from others, because their persons are not in account either for learning or authoritie.*

O. Alas, who seeth not this tumorous humour not only of folly and vanitie, but of wicked pride and envie swolne vp in the hearts of many, who can doe nothing else but abuse mens persons and their honest paines: yea of such evils of men may some iustly complaine, and of the cankred malice of these which haue whet their tongues like swords to speake sharp words most contumeliously: but in the truth I oppose against such the good and godly mans acceptance, my encouragement from the labours of these learned men, of whom I carefully take advise, also the solid reasons grounded vpon Gods word, and lastly my honest purpose of heart to make the truth knowne, as farre as I am able, for the very truths sake. An ill generation of men in these daies.

P. *Well, howsoever malignant spirits shall iudge of your labour and great paines in this thing, yet knowe that your faithfull frends, the virtuously minded soundlouers of the truth will take it well: let this giue you comfort, and in this assurance I pray you proceed.*

O. That am I willing to doe; but there is a stoppe in the way which is first to be remoued.

P. *I pray what is that?*

O. A notable tricke of *Bellarmine*, who seeing (as I suppose) in the truth of his owne soule, that *Peters* being at Rome could not be possibly proued by any verdict of truth, and therefore in his convinced iudgement, but a weake foundation to build their Popes headship vpon, he craftely seeketh against the light of his conscience, to shift it off, and saith, *nec requiri, nec sufficere*, that it is neither requisite, nor sufficient to make *Peter* the Bishop of Rome. Bellarmine is deceitfull in his dealing.

De Rom. Pontif. lib. 2. cap. 2. §. ex his quæ-

P. *Saith tum.*

P. *Saith he so indeed? I beleeue that neuer any before him made so light of this point; but dare he not defend it?*

O. Yes, he doth his very best to proue it, though he well knoweth, that there is no truth in the thing, nor any force of his reasons. For this is the manner of such vndertakers & champions for the Pope, to set themselues to proue any thing, and where they see themselues weake, there to make light of the matter, as not worth the standing vpon, though never so necessary, and by all meanes on their part to be defended, as this point is, because thus they would make their followers careless of the knowledge thereof, & divert their minds from seriously looking thereinto, and if it might bee, by this pollicie to prevent their aduersaries farther pursuite therein, least the truth should come to light.

A subtill pollicy of the aduersaries of the truth.

P. *Ah subtile sophister! But what will not a Iesuite doe to please his Lord the Pope, and for a Cardinals hat? I would fain knowe what reasons he hath so to speake, considering it hath formerly beene held as an article of their faith, and as the grand Charter to put the Pope into Peters seat, and to giue him possession of his Chaire.*

O. For his *non sufficere*, hee giueth this reason: because many might and did come to Rome, which were not Bishops of Rome.

P. *What say you to this?*

O. I grant the reason good: for if *Peters* being in a place make him Bishop of the same (as they take the word Bishop) then had he beene Bishop of Ierusalem, Cesarea, Samaria, Lydda, Ioppa, Antioch, and Babylon, which they wil not allow of. In this therefore wee agree with him, and approue of his reason as good, though his drift and scope bee starke naught, as before is noted.

Peters being at Rome not sufficient to make him Bishop of Rome if he had been there.

P. *What reason giueth he for his* non requiri; *and what thinke you of it?*

O. I thinke as before in his *non sufficere* he spake truly, so contrarily in this most falsly: *Peters* being at Rome was not sufficient but very necessary to make him Bishop there, as shall be shewed afterwards. The reason which he giueth for

It was yet requisite that he should haue beene there, if hee had beene the Bishoppe there.

this

this *non requiri* is, becauſe many were Biſhops of Rome which never came there, as *Clement. V. Iohn XXII. Benedict XII. Clement VI.* and *Innocentius VII.* which were made Biſhops in France, and there abode.

P. *What ſay you to this?*

O. I will not here ſhew how contrary this their Conſecratiõ (or rather Coronation, as *Platina* calleth it, for Popes will in ſpite of Chriſts precept, be kings, & aboue them too) is to Act. 14. 23. Tit. 1. 5. and the practiſe of the Primitiue Church, that any ſhould be a Biſhop where he never came: nor what ill ſucceſſe this had in the beginning, whereat Pope *Clement* the V. his Coronation: how *Philip* the French king was ſore hurt, how the *Duke of Britaine* was ſlaine and many others by caſualtie, how the Pope was put into great feare, and loſt a pretious iewell of great value: neither will I tell how *Platina* ſpeaketh of the damage, which this abſence of the Popes from Rome brought generally to all: But let this their abode in France be as it was; what is this to the point? Doth it follow, becauſe theſe abode in France and neuer came at Rome, that therefore it was not requiſite that *Peter* ſhould be there, and yet bee Biſhop of Rome: Muſt *Peter* as Biſhop (for ſo it muſt be vnderſtood and not as hee was an Apoſtle) be found irregular and a patterne of *non reſidence* during life, becauſe theſe irregular and lawleſſe men, which made their luſts a law were ſo? And is the caſe alike betweene a knowne and an eſtabliſhed Epiſcopall iuriſdiction for a long time, and the ſeat approued (whetherſoeuer the perſon then Biſhop be remoued for ſome cauſes) & that which at the firſt is to be made the Biſhops See, and neuer ſo before? as now the queſtion is of Romes iuriſdiction and headſhip over all other Churches, and that immediatly from the perſon of St *Peter*? Before *Bellarmine*, all made it the ground of *Peters* See at Rome and of his remouing the Chaire from Antioch thither. *Baronius* doth bring the Pope into *Peters* place no otherwiſe then by ſhewing how *Peter* came to Rome, and by his chaire there wherein he did ſit.

De vitis pontif. Rom.

Platina in vita Clement. V.

The Popes coronation in France began but vnhappily: for the Lord would haue Antichriſts ſeat at Rome.

Pope Marcellus *cap. rogamus 24. q. 1. in ca. ſacroſ. Rom. & Apoſt eccl. diſtinct. 12. Turne cremata ſumma de eccl. l. 2 c. 36. Canus Locorum theol. l. 6. cap. 8. Baron. Annal. Chriſ. 45, Pet. 1.*

P. *Belike then you hold it very neceſſarie for the Papiſts to main-*

maintaine Peters being at Rome, or elſe to yeeld that hee could not be there the Biſhop.

O. If they hold not this as an vndoubted truth, and abſolutly neceſſarie to make him Biſhop of Rome, they can never proue him there to be Biſhop. If hee never was there: how doe they knowe that hee tooke Rome for his chiefeſt ſeat, and tranſlated it from Antioch, where hee was firſt Biſhop as they ſay?

P. *It may be they will ſay (for to helpe themſelues they will ſay any thing) they knowe it by word, or by writing, or by ſome Revelation.*

Lib. 2. cap. 54. Morneus of the Church, cap. 8.

O. For the revelation fained, *Cuſanus* reiecteth as fabulous; he never deliuered it by word of mouth to any, that he would goe to Rome as *Paul* did Act. 19. 21. and there ſettle his ſeat of ſupremacie, which hee never had; if he ever told this in his abſence from Rome, then let him tell vs to whom he ſpoke it, when, and where? Yea what one approued witneſſe can they produce, ſhewing that *Peter* was Biſhop of Rome before hee came there? For his writing of any ſuch thing we find not, we read not that he ever wrote to any at Rome. He was much to blame (forgetfull and careleſſe man that he was) that writing two Epiſtles to the diſperſed in divers countries, he could not remember Rome, that glorious ſeate of his Prince-like ſupremacie: ſurely he did well deſerue for this his forgetful negligence to haue loſt his Vicarſhip. But it is not vnlike he ſued out a pardon for it, and ſo auoided his deprivation. Well, howſoever the matter was, we ſee that the Papiſts haue neither word nor writing, nor revelation from *Peter*, by which they might know how, that he choſe Rome for the ſeat of his Popedome: & therfore it muſt be by his perſonall being there, or els yeeld it to be a very idle dreame, or a matter of their owne meere imagination, without word, writing, revelation, or faithfull relation from any other, of *Peters* chuſing of Rome for his Seate.

Papiſts muſt hold it a neceſſary truth that *Peter* was at Rome, and that heereby onely in that place the Popes be *Peters* ſucceſſors, els they looſe their right in *Peter*.

P. *They will ſay, they doe knowe it from Chriſts words* paſce oves, *and* dabo claves: *in which words is both* Peters *duety and*

and authoritie laide downe before him, and imposed vpon him.

O. Theſe words were common to all the Apoſtles, and not peculiar to *Peter* : for were not all commanded to teach? *Mat.* 28.18.19. and gaue he not the like power to all? *Ioh.* 20.21.22.23. and did not S. *Paul* vſe the keyes? 1 *Cor.* 5. 2 *Cor.* 2,10. 1 *Tim.* 1.20. I hope they will not ſay, that he receiued this authoritie from S. *Peter*, but from Ieſus Chriſt, if they ſhould ſo ſay, S. *Paul* will deny it. Againe I aske them how they conclude from hence, that *Peter* was Biſhop of Rome? Chriſt ſaid, *paſce oves: dabo claves: ergò* he was Pope of Rome. They ſeeke in theſe words his ſupremacie: but by what quinteſſence of wit find they Rome heere? by what new Logicall skill can they conclude from hence that hee muſt needes bee Biſhop there? If they will needes haue Chriſts words to put him into poſſeſſion of his Biſhoprick at Rome, then would I faine know, why went he (as *Bellarmine* earneſtly contendeth againſt *Onuphrius* that he did) firſt vnto Antioch, there to be Biſhop? And if hee was there 7. yeares before he went to Rome: how is it that Antioch hath not the ſupremacie, ſeeing hee went thither, and made that (as they ſay) his firſt ſeate? how can they ſhew that it was tranſlated from thence to Rome; but by *Peters* being at Rome? I alſo deſire to know of them, whether Chriſt ſpake theſe words to *Peter* as to an Apoſtle, or to him as a Biſhop? If they ſay, as to a Biſhop, then Chriſt ſpake to him not as to the Prince of the Apoſtles, but as to one inferior to them all: for the Apoſtles could & did make Biſhops; but no mortall men could make Apoſtles, but only Ieſus Chriſt. By this ſaying they doe vilifie S. *Peter*, and vtterly loſe the ſupremacie, which they ſo eagerly contend for, by making him a Biſhop. If they ſay, as to an Apoſtle, then was he tyed to no certaine place, and if he was an Apoſtle, how dare they debaſe him, and make him inferiour to an Apoſtle? If yet for their owne advantage, as they fooliſhly thinke, they will needes haue him a Biſhop, though the Archbiſhop, and Primate of all other, and keepe his Apoſtleſhip: then muſt he be held a Biſhop, (as the Archbi-

Chriſt gaue no more to *Peter* than to all the reſt of the Apoſtles Gal. 1.1. & 2.6.

Lib. 2. de Pont. Rom.

Gal. 11. Papiſts falſly contend for a ſupremacie in *Peter*: and yet fooliſhly make him inferiour to all the Apoſtles. Mat. 28. Marke 16.

Lib.4.cap.5. de Rep. eccle.

shop of *Spalato* speaketh) either *in habitu*, and so *totius orbis*, and then no more the Bishop of Rome, then of Rhemes: or *in actu*, and so *illius tantum loci, in quo actu Apostolicum munus exercuerit*, as he did in Ierusalem, in Ioppa, Lydda, Cesarea, and Antioch; and therefore if hee never was at Rome, he could not be Bishop of Rome. And therefore *Bellarmine* for his *non requiri* is worthy to haue his hat pul'd off his head, and to be discardinalled for thus disvicaring the Pope, and disabling of him to claime for Rome any right of supremacie from S. *Peter*, if he never was there.

P. *They will say, it may easily be imagined, that* Peter *being (as they would haue him) the Prince of the Apostles, would chuse the principall Cities of the world then for his principall seate.*

O. What men may imagine, is one thing, and how they can shew the truth of that which they so imagine, is an other thing; let them shew vs by what evidence of truth *Peter* chose Rome to be his chiefe Seate, and so made the Bishops thereof his Successours before all others, if it was not by his comming to Rome.

Papists haue nothing to shew how *Peter* came to be Bishop of Rome, but by his being at Rome.

P. *I can not see what possibly they can make the ground thereof but this onely, and not any word from him, either by himselfe, or by any messenger sent thither, not by any letter of his, not by revelation from heauen (though perhaps from hell, whence they haue had many) nor by the words of Christ: therefore his being at Rome must make him Pope of Rome, or nothing, which if they cannot proue, their Popes authoritie is but feigned, and this his usurped supremacie is to be despised.*

O. You haue well concluded this point: and therefore if you please, I will proceede on, to proue him never to haue beene at Rome.

P. *But before, I pray you let me say to you one thing.*

O. What is that?

P. *Euen that which I haue heard learned men to say, to wit, that this is waste labour in you, because though it be yeelded them that* Peter *was at Rome, yet as* Bellarmine *saith, it is not sufficient to make him Bishop, the Prince of the Apostles,*

Christs Vicar there, these things can not be concluded from his being at Rome; and therefore seeing it gaineth the Adversarie nothing, neither disadvantageth vs any thing, it is to no purpose to contend with them about it. What say you to this?

O. I haue heard as much spoken my selfe, and I do grant that the Papists can not conclude from thence, what they would haue him to be; yet with all due respect and honour vnto all those learned men, I take it to be no needlesse labour, but a matter to be stood vpon with them, and that for many reasons.

It is no waste labor to proue *Peter* his not being at Rome.

P. *I would gladly heare them.*

O. First, Because we see that it, and none other is to bee held the ground and foundation necessarily of their Roman Babell, which being ouer-throwen, turneth ouer topsie turfie the whole building of the towrie headship of Rome. Secondly, because of the loue of the truth, which in this point God hath reuealed vnto vs, and in hatred of falshood, which hath in this tale beene so long obtruded vpon the world for an vndoubted truth: by which the more simple sort haue beene grosly seduced, and drawen to giue honour to that See of Rome. These are we to haue heerein respect vnto, and to giue them satisfaction: for albeit learned men know, that to grant *Peters* being at Rome is nothing, yet to shew to these, that he neuer was there, and to proue it to be but a fable, will more worke vpon them, than any other way of reasoning, to make them to reject the Popes authority, which they doe honour onely vpon this conceit, that they beleeue *Peter* to haue beene at Rome, and so the Pope to be indeed his Successour. Thirdly, because the denyall of this, and the enforcing of them to proue it soundly, or els to yeeld, will cut off infinite disputations and troublesome controuersies arising out of it, wearying euen to the death many learned men on both sides. For if *Peter* must necessarily be at Rome to make him Pope there, and yet it be proued that he neuer was at Rome. What neede we dispute of the succession there, of the *Popes* power, of the prerogatiues of that See, and a thousand such matters of controuersies,

Reasons to moue vs to deny *Peter* his being at Rome, and to stand out in it against the Papists.

betweene vs and them, all depending vpon *Peters* Episcopall jurisdiction at Rome? Fourthly, because, though it will not disaduantage vs, neither will gaine them any thing, to grant him to haue beene there. Yet the prouing of him not to haue beene at Rome, will greatly endamage them. First, this will ouerthrow the credit of all their traditions; for if this master tradition bee found a lye, who will beleeue any of the rest? for nothing can bee said for a tradition (sauing the witnes of God, of Christ, of his Apostles, of any approoued witnes which heard or saw Peter at Rome, which yet this tradition hath not attained vnto) but this hath it, *Councils, Canons, Fathers, Popes, the aurea Legenda*, a yearely remembrance of *Peters* Chaire, the seate it selfe, his sepulchre, miracles and wonders done thereby, and the witnes of Pilgrims running to Rome to visit his sepulchre. And therefore if this bee counterfeite stuffe, farewell the credit of all other their relations which they make for the honour of their Pope, their Church and seruice. Secondly, this being fully discouered, (as by Gods blessed aid it may) and generally made knowen, it will weaken the Popes authoritie, in the hearts of all such, as through ignorance of this truth, and by beleeuing *Peter* to haue beene at Rome, did the Pope almost, if not altogether, diuine honour, presuming him to be *Peters* true Successour, & Christ his Vicar heere vpon earth. Thirdly, this will shew the folly of their religious conceit of their Pope, the vanitie of their faith, setled onely vpon the sayings and writings of men, without the word, the falshood of the Popes titles, and his hellish pride in his usurped supremacie, the cursed confidence they haue had to his foolish and also blasphemous pardons, by which they haue beene imboldened to sinne, made vainely confident of the remission of their sinnes, and so secured of life, with some short time of paines in Purgatorie, when they did runne the way of eternall death. Lastly, this is as the sword, not to hackle him, or to cut off some parts, of him, but to smite off that *Golyas* head at one blow, and as gun-powder, to blow vp him and his seate (as they would

It doth greatly endamage the Romish Religion, and that many wayes. It weakeneth the authority of all their own traditiõs.

It treadeth the Popes authority vnder foot.

It discovereth the vanity and folly of the Papists faith.

It smiteth off the Popes head, & bloweth vp his seat like gun-powder.

would haue done heere the Parliament house, helliſh and traiterous murtherers as they were:) to make ſo an end of one warre with theſe ſuperſtitiouſly heatheniſh Philiſtims, that ſo we the Iſraelites of God may liue in peace. Theſe be my inducements to thinke my labour not waſte, neither of any other which ſhall ſtand out with them in this point, what doe you thinke of them?

P. *In my poore iudgmẽt, the reaſons are of force to perſwade learned men to labour more in this matter and to preſſe the aduerſaries, either certainly to proue it, as they ought to do, and as faine they would, if they could, becauſe it is an article of their faith and a foundamentall point of their religion, by which their Pope and Head liueth or dyeth: or els ingeniouſly acknowledge, now at the length, and deceiue no more the world, that their building is but vpon a ſandie ground, their faith fixed vpon a very fable, or at the beſt but vpon the fallible ſayings of men, & not from the holy truth of God; and therefore as a learned man ſaith,* Nemo Papiſticam religionem fide retinere, aut ſequi poteſt, ſed opinione tantum, aut conjectura, quia quod hujus religionis fundamentum eſt, ſub fidem non cadit; *therefore can there be no certaintie in their Religion, to ſettle mens conſciences.* *Whitak. lib. de Pont. Rom. controu. 4 queſt. 3.*

O. It is very true that you ſay: and therefore ſeeing you ſo well like of my reaſons, and ſee ſo good cauſe why *Peters* being at Rome ſhould be denyed, and the contrary prooued againſt thoſe Peterſ-Popes, I will now proceede.

P. *I earneſtly intreat you ſo to doe, and I wiſh that you may as well ſatisfie me in this, as you haue in thoſe things before going.*

O. I hope I ſhall, and all ſuch louers of the truth as you be.

P. *Haue you many reaſons?*

O. I haue many and ſound reaſons, as I take them, to proue that *Peter was neuer at Rome.*

P. *What is the firſt of them?*

O. My firſt reaſon is this, becauſe the bringing of *Peter* proue

Reaſons perſwading that *Peter* was neuer at Rome.

to Rome, both for the time, either when he went thither, or how long he abode there, as also for the place where before they say he was Bishop, and there planted the Church, is found by the Scriptures very evidently to be an vntruth: for first they say he went the first time to Rome in the 2. of *Claudius*: but we finde him both before, at that time, and after, in Ierusalem and Iewrie and the coastes thereabout, out of which he neuer went till after the Councill at Ierusalem 7. yeares after the 2. of *Claudius*. Then they say that hee was 25. yeares Bishop of Rome, after hee had beene 7. yeares at Antioch, which also is as vntrue as the other: for *Peter* did not outliue *Paul*, if, as they say, they both in one yeare and the same day suffered together. Now *Paul* after his conuersion liued not aboue 33. or 34. yeares: if he suffered in the 12. (as *Epiphanius*) or 13. of *Nero* (as *Baronius* confidently avoucheth it. Now *Bellarmine* himselfe alloweth *Peter* 5. yeares to abide in Iewry, (but *Onuphrius* 9. as well he might, and more yeares too, euen till the Councill which was in the 18. of *Pauls* conversion) then 7. yeares at Antioch, and 25. at Rome; now 5. 7. and 25. come vnto 37. yeares, longer then *Peter* did liue: but take out 18. yeares, in which *Peter* was in and about Iewry, and 7. yeares for his being at Antioch (for hee went not thither before the 18. yeares) and then there remaineth but 9. yeares for his being at Rome. Thus is his 25. yeares pitifully curtaled, and the falshood discouered. Now for the first place where he was Bishop, to wit, at Antioch, as *Bellarmine* contendeth by many testimonies against *Onuphrius*, where, saith *Eusebius*, *fundavit Ecclesiam*, it is flat against the Scripture, *Act.* 11. 19. 26. Thus wee see how this storie of bringing *Peter* to Rome beginneth with neuer a word of truth.

The Papists tell this tale at the first with many lies, plainely convicted by the Scriptures.

Lib. de Pont. Rom. Euseb in Chro.

P. *If thus they begin, a man may haue good cause to call the whole matter into question, for truth needeth no lye for the foundation. What is your second reason?*

O. My second reason is, because his journeying to Rome, set out by *Metaphrastes*, the Revelation of the translation of his seate from Antioch to Rome, mentioned in

The relation of three things most necessary

Gratians

Gratians decrees, and his death set out by *Linus*; are reiected as vntrueths by three learned Cardinals on their side, *Baronius*, *Cusanus* and *Bellarmine*. So then, that we finde; the time of his going to be fabulous; his journeying thither to be no truth; his planting of the Church at Antioch flat against Gods word; his translation from thence to Rome, a feigned dreame; his reigne at Rome for 25. yeares, impossible to be true; and his dying there (as *Linus* (who must be his successour) relateth it) a very fiction: may not these things perswade vs that *Peter* was neuer at Rome?

to be proued, is by learned Papists reiected as fabulous.

Annal. Eccl. 44. Claudii 2. lib. 2. cap. 54. Bellarm. de pont. Rom. lib. 2.

P. *I neuer heard so much before: perswade say you! who can not but be perswaded to heare these things? If you thus goe on, you will make it credible to the very aduersaries, that he was neuer there. What is, I pray you, your third reason?*

O. My third reason is, because it can not be proued out of the Scripture; there is not any one word which either doth tell vs of any minde in *Peter* to goe thither, as was in *Paul*, *Act.* 19.21. or of the Lords fore-telling of him, that he should goe thither, as he fore-told *Paul*, *Act.* 23.11. Neither doth *Luke* in the Acts write either of his going to Rome, or of his being there; and yet hee nameth many places where hee was. Hee also mentioneth Rome fiue times, and writeth of *Pauls* going thither, of his abode there, with whom he was, as may be well supposed vnto the day of his death, 2 *Tim.* 4. and yet neuer speaketh one word of *Peters* being there.

No Scripture for it, but rather altogether against it.

P. *It may be, they will say, that it followeth not, because* Luke *doth not mention his being there, that he was not there: for he telleth not of his being at Antioch, & yet we know by S.* Paul *that he was there.*

O. First I stand not onely vpon S. *Lukes* silence, but of S. *Pauls* too, yea of the whole New testament, in which is not one syllable to proue his being there. Secondly, I answere, that the reason were not good, if it had not beene a matter most necessary to haue beene remedied.

If Peter had been at Rome (if it were true, which Papists hold him to be) it would, yea it should haue certainely bin recorded in Scripture.

P. *How proue you it so necessary, that if* Peter *had beene at Rome, it should some-where in the New Testament haue beene set downe plainly?*

O. I proue it from that, which they themselues hold, That *Peter* being appointed to be Lord and Monarch of the Catholicke Church was the Bishop of Rome, and so onely the Church of Rome is the Catholicke Church, that the Pope is *Peters* Successour, and so the Head of this Romane Catholicke Church, on which all must depend, and of which all must be, vnlesse they will be damned, as they say. Now these being such maine points of their saluation, and these depending vpon *Peters* being at Rome (for if he was not at Rome, he was not there the Bishop, as before I haue shewed, if not the Bishop, then the Church of Rome is not the Catholike Church, nor the Pope *Peters* Successour, and so not the Head of the Church, by any right from S. *Peter*) it was of absolute necessitie, to haue his being at Rome recorded; yea God in his mercie, for the better assuring the truth of those necessarie points of salvation (as they hold them) could not, nor would haue omitted the ground heereof, but some one penman or other of his spirit should haue recorded the same.

It is not credible that Peter was at Rome, the same not being recorded in the Scripture.

P. *Truely it can not reasonably be imagined, that so necessary a point should be omitted; and is it credible, that so high & eminent a person (as they would haue him to be) if he had beene knowen for the Monarch of Christs Church heere on earth, & that he had chosen Rome for his seate, that the Bishops thereof should onely succeede him in that high office, and that Church be made the head of all Churches, out of which no salvation, is it I say any way credible, that his iourney thither, to that chiefe Citie then in the world, to establish that authoritie vpon his Successours, to advance Rome to such immortall glorie to the worlds end should be so prinily vndertaken, and so finished, that no mention should be made thereof, neither by* Luke, *nor* Paul, *nor by himselfe, nor by any other Apostle, when he went, from whence, with whom, by what meanes at any time? for my part, I can not be induced so to thinke, now knowing what I doe know*

of

of this fabulous narration.

O. You see now I perceiue the force of this my third reason, though at the first it seemed but weake.

P. *Yea, that I doe very well; I pray you what is your next reason?*

O. My fourth reason is, because *Peters* going to Rome, the chiefe Citie of the Gentiles, agreeth not with that covenant made betwixt him and *Paul*, in *Gal.* 2. to wit, that *Paul* should goe to the Gentiles, and he to the Iewes. This covenant was made vpon the effectuall worke of God, seen plainly and distinctly in the ministerie of *Peter* towards the Iewes, and *Pauls* towards the Gentiles: to the one was committed the Gospell of the Vncircumcision, and to the other the Gospell of the Circumcision, which (as saith S. *Ierome* (agreeable to the truth of the text it selfe) was done by the hand of God, whereto agreeth that of learned *Calvin*: *Spiritus sanctus ita diuisit prouincias inter eos, vt* Petrum *Iudæis*, Paulum *Gentibus destinaret.* And this was not done of them without consent of other the Apostles in the same thing. Whereupon *Peter* is called the Apostle of the Circumcision, and *Paul* the Apostle of the Gentiles. Therefore *Peter* left the Gentiles to *Paul*, and hee went to the Iewes, to whom he wrote his Epistles, and among whom he bestowed his ministerie, neither do we reade of his preaching among the Gentiles, but in *Cæsarea*; neither had hee any instance to alledge, as it may seeme, for himselfe at the Councill many yeares after, but that onely: who can then thinke, that he went to the head Citie of the Gentiles, to be the head of the Gentiles, except hee should be a covenant-breaker, and doe directly against his compact made with S. *Paul*?

It agreeth not with the covenant made betweene him & S. *Paul* the Apostle of the Gentiles Gal. 2. 7.

Ierom. on Gal. 2.

Instit. 1. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 6.

Rom. 11. 13. Gal. 2. 9. 1. Pet. 1. 1. 2 Pet. 3. 1. Act. 10. Act. 15.

P. *S.* Paul *they will say, did without blame preach, for all this covenant to the Iewes, as we reade in the Acts, and then why might not also S.* Peter *preach vnto the Gentiles?*

O. It was not vnlawfull for *Peter* to preach to the Gentiles sometimes, and *Paul* to the Iewes, as he did; but this saith *Whitakers*, *fuit quasi extraordinarium, & in morbo, ut*

it were by the way, and not in the most common, ordinary and vsuall course. *Paul* was to offer salvation to the Iewes, but he was chiefly sent vnto the Gentiles, and *Peter* principally to the Iewes, and therefore did not goe to Rome the principall seate of the Gentiles, to teach them. And if they will say, it might be to teach the Iewes there; I answere, that *Peter* needed not, neither would he haue gone so farre to a few Iewes at Rome, and haue so many thousands in the Countries neere to Iudea, as in those countries to whom he wrote, and in Egypt and other nations Northward, Eastward and Southward from Iewry: for who can otherwise thinke, but he being the Apostle of the Iewes, would goe into those parts where most Iewes did dwell? And as for his teaching of the Iewes at Rome wee finde them ignorant of Christ altogether when *Paul* came thither, as afterward shall be shewed; and therefore if *Peter* was there before him to teach he was either very negligent in teaching, or voide of all fruit among them: neither of which may be imagined when we finde every-where in him the contrary.

Act. 13. 46. Act. 22. 21.

An objection. The answere.

The end why they say Peter went to Rome.

P. *I haue read, that* Peter *was not brought to Rome to preach either to the Iewes or Gentiles; but for another end, to haue a conflict with* Simon Magus: *and this is the end indeede commonly spoken of by writers.*

Egesipp. lib. 3. cap. 2. Euseb. lib. 2. cap. 13. & 14. Ierom. descrip. Eccle. in Petro. Metaphrastes: Isodorus. Baronius in annal. Chri. 68. Petri 24.

O. You say very true: so they tell the tale, If this was the end, he did not then belike goe to Rome to be the vniversall Bishop there, to translate his seate from Antioch thither, to make the Pope the Prince of Prelates, and the Church of Rome *Caput omnium Ecclesiarum*, and the same to be intituled Catholicke, and if not for these ends, why make they so great a stirre in the Christian world, to exalt Rome, and the Romane Bishop by his comming to Rome, when no such thing was intended?

P. *I perceiue* (Orthologus) *that it is impossible to make of many tales a true storie: let them coyne them, and then fashion them, as well as they can, they will appeare to be counterfeite. I now perceiue that the fablers of Peters going to Rome, striue to faine great and high matters from him, to the glorie of the*

Pope, and Romes eternall renowne, and yet had not the wit to inuent an end of his going to Rome, tending that way, but an other in my iudgement, nothing to that purpose: of which I pray you let mee heare your opinion, and what you thinke of that conflict.

O. I take it to be a very fable, inuented to make a beginning of that tale of *Peters* going to Rome.

Peters conflict with Simon Magus but a fiction and the reasons why it may bee so iudged.

P. What maketh you to thinke so?

O. I haue many reasons to perswade me thereunto, as first for that it beginneth fabulously; much being spoken of this *Symon* whiles he was in Iudea, of which *Luke* speaketh not one word, as that he was the chiefe of the heretiques, a great aduersary vnto the holy Apostles & manifestly known to haue dealt maliciously against *Peter*, and being not able to abide, fled at the length out of those coasts to Rome; and *Peter* is called the Prince of the Apostles, which smelleth of Antichristianisme, and is contrary to *Luke*, 22.25.26. neither doe wee read that *Simon* did oppose *Peter*, either by broaching of hereticall opinions or otherwise, but was rather strucken with feare, praying *Peter* and *Iohn* to pray for him, who did not stay at Samaria where *Simon* was, but went to Ierusalem, and there left *Simon*, of whom the Scripture speaketh not one word more. If this *Simon* had beene such a grand heretique in those coasts, and had so manifestly dealt maliciously against *Peter*, why did not *Luke* mention the same as well as hee did the wickednesse of *Elymas* against *Paul*? It is no way seeming likely that Luke would haue omitted it, if any such thing had beene, especially hee hauing described him so fully before, what hee was before *Philip* came to Samaria, how he entertained the Gospell, & was baptised, how hee discouered the wickednesse of his heart, then how hee was humbled at the words of *Peter*, if withall we doe consider him to haue beene (if it were true, which they say of him) the first grand heretique falling fro the truth, and first that did affront the Apostles in their ministerie: it had beene much to the glory of God, and furtherance of the Gospell to haue had his euills laid open, & the

Euseb. l. 2. c. 14. It is begun with a fabulous speech.

Act. 8. 24. 25.

power of the blessed Apostles seene against such an Apostate as it was seene against the hypocrites *Ananias* and *Saphira*: And therefore he being left in his humiliation without mentioning of any opposition, we may wel thinke there was no such thing. Secondly, Because the time imagined of bringing *Peter* to Rome, to haue this conflict with this *Magus*, to wit in the 2. of *Claudius*, is found flat contrary to the Scripture, and so a very lye. Thirdly, Because they make this *Simon* renowned at Rome, deceauing and seducing the people before *Peter* came thither, and though *Paule* was at Rome before *Peter* (as after shall be shewed) yet *Paul* must not haue to doe with him before *Peter*, but *Peter* forsooth must bee fetched from Ierusalem or Antioch, he must come so farre, and take so long a iourney to doe the feat. Is this likely? Had *Paul* lesse zeale, or power to oppose & confound this, then he had in rebuking sharply, & smiting with blindnesse that sorcerer *Elimas*, seeing hee was sent by Christ to Rome to set forth his name, and was indeed the Apostle of the Gentiles? Fourthly, Because of the vncertaine telling of the tale, in many particulars. 1. in the manner of *Simons* going, who went to Rome by sea saith *Eusebius*, he did flye to Rome saith *Egesippus*, lifted vp of divells saith *Clement*, vnderpropped of two divels saith *Sulpitius*: but who saw thē? or how knewe they these things? 2. The conflict, most say was betweene him and St *Peter*; but *Cyril*, *Sulpitius*, *Ambrose*, and also *Gregorie Turonensis*, say he was overcome by *Peter* and *Paul*. 3. Touching the issue *Egesippus* and *Clement* say that in the conflict he fell downe and broke his legges & ioints, of which after he died, but *Cyrill* and *Sulpitius* say he brast in sunder and died forthwith. 4. Concerning the time when this was, *Eusebius* saith, the conflict was in the raigne of *Claudius*, and so saith also *Iustine Mart.*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and S. *Ierome*, and that then the power of *Simon* came to naught; but *Egesippus* and other make it to be towards the end of *Nero*. Who for the death of *Magus* cast *Peter* into prison, and so after put him to death for the same: and so must he by this reckning be 25 yeares in overcomming this

The time whē is found false.

It derogateth from Paules power & authoritie, to magnify Peter

Act. 13. 10. 11.

Act. 25. 11.

The tale is vncertainly told.

Euseb. l. 2. c. 14.
Egesip. l. 3. c. 2.
Clem. l. 6. c. 9.
Sulpit. lib. 2. sacræ histor.
Cyril. ca. 6.
Sulpit. 2. hist. sic.
Ambr. serm. 66.
Turon de glor. Mart. l. 1. c. 28.
Euseb. lib. 2. cap. 14. 15.
Iust. Apo.
Ireneus l. 1. c. 20
Tertul. Apo. c. 13
Ierom. de viris illust. in Petro.

sorcerer

ſorcerer, from the ſecond of *Claudius* to the laſt of *Nero*. And can this be likely, that Peter comming to Rome by the inſpiration of God (as *Euſebius* ſaith) and fenced with the divine armour of God, and brought for this end thither, ſhould haue ſuch ill ſucceſſe as not to prevaile againſt one man? Or will they abſurdly ſay, that hee came in the ſecond of *Claudius*, and went from thence afterwards as *Bellarmine* dreameth, and left the ſeat vndone, for which hee came for ſo long time? Who can with reaſon ſo thinke? Laſtly, I take it to be a fable, becauſe *Egeſippus* & *Abdias*, and ſome ſuch which write moſt of it, are iudged to be fabulous authors, and the relation made thereof by them, is ſo full of abſurd & ridiculous matter, as none that hath common ſenſe can giue credit to them.

The authors of this relatiõ are fabulous & counterfets.

P. *Sir, I doe thanke you for this: I ſee here fable vpon fable, to bring* Peter *to Rome; and to make the Pope his ſucceſſour: but that I ſee ſuch apparant reaſons, I ſhould not haue thought that men of learning would once by their pennes haue ſet down ſuch idle, fooliſh, and falſe tales; but I haue here too long by this occaſion interrupted you. I pray you goe on, and tell me what your next reaſon is, why you thinke* Peter *was not at Rome?*

O. I doe not take this as an interrupting of me any whit at all, for that this is much to the purpoſe wee haue in hand, and it may bee the *fift reaſon* to perſwade vs that Peter was never at Rome, becauſe this b ing, by all our adverſaries made the end of Peters going thither, is found to be but an invented tale.

P. *Indeed, this may well goe for the fift reaſon, and ſo let it: what is then the ſixt?*

Peters being at Rome cannot be proued likely in any reaſonable mans iudgement by our adverſaries.

O. My ſixt reaſon is, becauſe our adverſaries, who ſtand for his being at Rome, and beleeue and defend it as an article of their faith, yet with all the wit, learning, and reading that they haue, they cannot proue it to be true, nor vndeniable as they ought from the Scripture whatſoeuer they hold as fundamentall, for that all ſuch matters are there ſet down plainely (as ſaith S. *Auguſtine*) or not to bee credited, but not probably by any reaſonable arguments. *Bellarmine* who is

Aug. l. 2. c. 9. de doct. chriſtiana & l. 2. c. 6. cont. lit. Petiliani.

is *instar omnium* hath ſwet out the quinteſſence of his ſophiſticall wit about it, and cannot make it good, his reaſons be but few, and very fooliſh, fully anſwered by three of our learned men, *Sybrandus*, *Iunius*, and *Whitacres*. Now if Peters being at Rome were true: may wee thinke that our adverſaries could not proue it being ſo vrged, and put vnto it by vs, if any ſhew of truth were on their ſide? There want not among them men of learning and of great reading: they want no bookes, that may ſerue for their helpe herein, they haue had time enough to ſearch it out, & yet hitherto they haue produced, neither ſound arguments, nor ſufficient witneſſes for this; being a matter *de facto* only, as I ſhall make it cleere hereafter, before I end this our conference.

P. *I was about to obiect mens teſtimonies: but ſeeing you haue reſerued your anſwer to ſome other time, I will not trouble you, till you haue deliuered your reaſons. What is the next reaſon?*

Our adverſaries diſagree wholy in every circūſtance

O. My ſeauenth reaſon is, becauſe of the diſcord among theſe grand maſters; they cannot agree among themſelues. One affirmeth, another denieth, one ſaith, another vnſaith, and the iarre is ſuch, as cannot be reconciled. Peter was in Iewrie after Chriſts paſſion ſaith *Bellarmine*, but fiue yeares: yes nine yeares, ſaith *Onuphrius*: He went to Rome, ſaith *Bellarmine*, in the 2. of *Claudius*: nay, that is not ſo, ſaith *Caietane*, for he was at Ieruſalem in the ſixth, or perad venture in the ſeauenth of *Claudius*. He went (ſay ſome) from Ieruſalem to Rome (and doe ſuppoſe it out of *Act.* 12. 17. But *Anacletus* will haue him goe to Antioch, and from thence to Rome: which *Onuphrius* denieth, and would haue him firſt at Rome then at Antioch, and after at Rome againe, finely ambling betweene two Biſhopricks, being but ſo little, ſo very little way aſunder, not paſt an 1800 miles betwene the one citie and the other; but what was this to Peter that rode vpon *Pegaſus*? They ſay he tranſlated his ſeat to Rome fro Antioch, but *Anterius* the Pope (as *Nicephorus* relateth) ſpeaketh of his ſeat alſo at *Alexandria*. Seaven yeares was he Biſhop of Antioch (ſaith *Bellarmine*) and with him many others

On *Platina in vita Petri.*
On Gal. 2.
Anaclet. ep. 3.
Nicepb. lib. 14. *cap.* 39.

others more: nay, saith Cardinall *Cortesius*, you are deceaued, for it was but fiue yeares, and addeth these words, *Nullum grauem authorem septennium illud approbare*: You both, saith *Onuphrius*, yea and all other which hold him to be seauen at Antioch and twentie fiue at Rome, are grosly deceaued, for he was but 25 yeares in both: for hee liued not but 24 yeares and odde months after Christ: and hee abode in Iewrie 9 of these yeares, how then could he liue 7 and 25 in the other two places? This opinion *Bellarmine* doth so stomacke, as hee vtterly falleth out with *Onuphrius*, and beateth him with many reasons, such as they bee, to vphold a fable, and will (in spight of the Pye) haue Peter 7 at Antioch, and 25 yeares at Rome, after the most common relation of this fabulous narration (for he loueth the lye for antiquitie sake) and therefore to make his account iust, hee will haue peter to liue 37 yeares, 5 in Iewrie, 7 at Antioch, and 25 at Rome: When hee hath feigned the length of Peters life, he can then (blessing on his wise heart) tell you particularly without erring one yeare, how long hee was in every place. The Rhemists will haue Peter at Rome when Paul wrote to the Romans, and there to receaue private letters from Paule (for they saw and read them, or had this knowledge by revelation, or rather not to wrong them, by dreame) because paul saluteth him not in his publike epistle: But *Bellarmine*, who being a learned Iesuite and Cardinall, and so knewe more then the Colledge of Rhemisticall priests, saith he was not at Rome, but was departed thence, by reason of *Claudius* edict against the Iewes, commanding them al to depart out of Rome. Thus hee teacheth his Rhemists to speake with more reason; though neither he, nor they care how they oppose the truth. Some will haue Peter perpetually resident at Rome 25 yeares: but *Onuphrius* will haue him double charged, and to keepe both. *Bellarmine* will haue him absent some few yeares: but his hat cannot tell him how many: but *Cortesius* (as *Whitacres* noteth) maketh him *non resident* for 16 yeares, from the 20 after Christ in the 11 of *Claudius* vnto the 36 of Christ and in the 13 of *Nero*, *Bellarmine* and o-

Cortesius ad persuas. 2.

Rhem. on Rom. cap. 16.

thers will needs haue Peter to dye in the 37 after Christ, and in the 14 of *Nero*. But *Baronius* will at no hand allow it, making his daies to end in the 13 of *Nero*. And thus we see how they bee together by the eares, in almost every thing, sauing in this generall, that they say, he was at Rome: but neither knowe when he went, from whence, how long hee abode there, nor where he was when he went thence: let them but particularize any thing, and we shall see the generall sound vntrue by the same, and their discord so great as nothing but the sound of a fable commeth to the eares of such as be wise, and not fooliſhly credulous.

P. *This their discord and so greatly dissenting of one from another vtterly discrediteth their cause, and peirceth to the very heart the credit thereof, proclaiming openly to the world, that the matter about which they are thus busied, is to them most vncertaine, and may well of vs be concluded to be but a fiction. But haue you yet any more reasons to perswade that hee was never at Rome?*

Peter was not at Rome while Paul liued.

O. Surely this one and no moe, which is the last, but not of the least waight effectually to perswade; and it is this: Because I finde, going along with Paul in his peregrination according to the Scripture, from place to place, and yeare after yeare, vnto his second answer before *Nero*, a little before his death, that Peter al this time had never bin at Rome.

P. *If you can proue this soundly, there need no moe reasons to perswade any indifferent man.*

A true Chronology of Pauls peregrination, will most of all cleere this point.

O. I doubt not by Gods assistance to make it very cleere that Peter after Christs death and Pauls conversion had never beene at Rome during the raigne of *Tiberius*, nor in the raigne of *Caligula*, nor in all the daies of *Claudius*, nor in the time of *Nero*, till S. Paul had finished his course and ministerie, and the time of his departure and martyrdome was at hand. If a true and perfect Chronologie be made of Paules peregrination from yeare to yeare, obseruing therein, 1. *To what cities and countries he travelled*, 2. *The distance between*, 3. *In what space of time he might make such iournies*. 4. *How long he abode in every citie & country vntill he came to Rome*.

What is to be obserued in Paules peregrination.

5. How

3. *How long he abode there, and what Epistles hee wrot from thence, and when he before wrot to the Romans.* It will appeare hereby, as cleerely as may be, that Peter was never at Rome.

P. *This is darke to me: I cannot conceaue how Paules peregrination is any thing to the purpose, to proue Peters not being at Rome.*

O. This is very much to the purpose: the knowledge whereof gaue me the greatest insight into this thing, and most perswaded me to denie Peters being there. For you must vnderstand: First, that they make *Peter* and *Paul* to suffer martyrdome together in the same yeare, and in the same day: then that *Paul* and *Peter* met often (as Luke in the Acts recordeth) and the yeares of their meeting may be obserued when they met, & the place where. Thirdly, that *Pauls* Epistles, evē to his death afford many reasons against *Peters* being at Rome either with *Paul*, or before *Pauls* being there: And therefore, if they will haue *Peter* to liue no longer than *Paul*, but to die with him, and if then it cannot be proued both by his and *Peters* severall travels, by their meetings together, and from sound reasons out of the Scriptures, written by S. *Paul* and *Luke* his companion to the death, that *Peter* was not at Rome, all S. *Pauls* time; thē was he never there. But this will be proued. If any say he might be before *Pauls* conversion, the Scripture in the Acts will confute them: if after his death, let them produce any such testimonie if they can, which so saith: and the old age of *Paul* when he wrote from Rome, permitteth vs not to think that *Peter* did out liue him, who was a married man before Pauls conversion, and before Christ began to preach when Paul was but young, when hee was converted after Christs death. But I need not stand vpon this, because none bring Peter to Rome before Pauls conversion, nor after his death, but in his life time. And therefore if Peter was not in the time of Paul at Rome: it must bee vndeniably true, that he never came there.

How Pauls peregrination maketh much for this matter *Baron. Annal. Christ. 69. Petri 25. num 2. Iacob. de Vorag. in legenda de Petro Can. distin. 22. ea. sacros.*

Act. 7. 58.

P. *I now perceiue well your meaning: now tell mee I pray you when Paul was converted, and how long he liued after?*

O. Paul was converted in the yeare after Christs passiō who did suffer in the 34 of his age: for hee began to preach when hee was about 30, *Luk.* 3.23. and continued aboue three yeares, and was crucified in the fourth, for we finde in the Euangelist after Christ began to preach, to his suffering, foure Easters. And saith Doctor Reynolds, *Paul* was not presently converted, after Christs death, as indeed it may easily appeare out of the Acts, where in chapt. 1.2.3.4.5.6.7.& 8. are many things recorded to be done before his conversion mentioned in the 9. chapter, which could not bee done so immediatly after Christs passion, but some reasonable time must be allowed for the same. And if they grant but halfe a yeare, it must needs be in the yeare of Christ 35, and hereto doe assent both Protestants and Papists, which 35 yeare was in the 19 of the raigne of *Tiberius*. After his conversion hee liued not 37 yeares, as *Bellarmine* & others with him would haue it. For Peter and hee suffered vpon one and the same day, in the same yeare (say they) but saith *Onuphrius* Peter liued but 34 yeares after Christs death, 3 months and odde daies, and *Baronius* saith, that Peter and Paul suffered in the 13 of *Nero*. & avoucheth it impossible to bee true that they should suffer in the 14 of *Nero*: but in the 13, or rather in the 12 as *Epiphanius* will haue it. Now from the 19 of *Tiberius* being the first of Paul to the beginning of the 12 of *Nero*, is 33 yeares, one month and three weekes, and two daies after *Dion* his account of the yeares of the Emperours raignes. For *Tiberius* raigned 23. yeares 7 monthes and 5 daies, of which from the beginning of the 19 must be reckned 4 yeares 7 months and 5 daies. *Caligula* 3 yeares 9 months and 28 daies, *Claudius* 13 yeares 8 months and 20 daies, and the 11 yeares of *Nero* vnto the 12 come iust to the forenamed summe. *Epiphanius* his opinion who wil haue this martyrdome to be in the 12 of *Nero*, is indeed the most agreeable to the truth, as after I will shew in the Chronologie, and therefore S. Paul must liue after his conversion but 33 yeares and suffer in the 34 and so long must Peter liue, and no longer if they suffered together, as they will haue

Euseb. l. 1. c. 11. Heluicus in chron. num. xxij. Iob. 2. 13. 23. & 6. 4. & 11. 55. & 19. 4. Rain. ag. Hart. cap. 6. diuis. 3.

Carion l. 3. Ant. de Dom. in tab. chronol. Funct. Chron. Buchol. Pantal. Baron. in Annal. Onuph in Plat. In annal. Christ. 69. Petri 25.

haue them. Now in all these yeares of S. Pauls life, Peter was never at Rome.

P. *I long to see the proofe of this: for if it be so, it will make the matter cleare, and put it out of all controversie.*

O. It is granted by *Bellarmine*, and not denyed by any, that *Peter* was the first fiue yeares of *Pauls* conversion in Iewry and the coastes thereabouts, as is gathered out of the Acts, chap. 9.32.43. and 10.24.48. and 11.2. Gal. 1.18. Then after for 7. yeares more, when *Paul* went from Ierusalem to Tarsus, (Act. 9.30. Gal. 2.11.) and then to Antioch, where he with *Barnabas* abode a whole yeare, Act. 11.26. and then afterwards were sent to Ierusalem with reliefe to the Saints there, Act. 11.20. which was in the 13. of *Pauls* conuersion, *Peter* was not at Rome, neither had beene as yet there. For *Bellarmine* alloweth these 7. yeares to be spent at Antioch, where *Peter* was first Bishop (as they say) and therefore he could not be at Rome, as yet; neither indeede was he now at Antioch to plant the Church there: for no Apostle taught first at Antioch, Act. 8.1. but some other, as men of *Cyprus* and *Cyrene*, Act. 11.19.20. and the first person of note was *Barnabas*, the next was *Paul*, who was fetched thither by *Barnabas* from Tarsus, Act. 11.25.26. which *Barnabas* neither needed nor would haue done had *Peter* beene there: who indeed came not thither, till after the Councill at Ierusalem, as after shall be shewed, but abode at Ierusalem and in Iewrie, and in the coastes thereof: for before *Paul* went to Antioch, we finde *Peter* at Ierusalem, Act. 11.2. and when *Paul* came with *Barnabas* to Antioch, *Peter* was then at Ierusalem in prison, Act. 12.3. so as *Peter* for 12. yeares of *Pauls* conversion had not beene at Antioch much lesse at Rome.

l. 2. de pont. Rom. *Onuphr.* a man (saith *Reinolds* against *Hart*) most deuout to the Pope, (not therefore to be suspected) and most skilfull in Antiquities and stories of the Church (and therefore to be credited) saith, that *Peter* was for 9. yeares in Iewry, which he constantly auoucheth, and saith he hath proued it by many reasons in his annot. on *Platina in vita Petri.* *Peter* did not plant the Church of Antioch, as Papists teach, flat against the Scripture.

P. *What yeare was it, I pray you, that* Peter *was put into prison by* Herod?

O. It was saith *Carion* in the 4. of *Claudius*: for now was the famine mentioned in Act. 11.28. and that saith *Orosius*, was in the 4. of *Claudius*, in which yeare also *Herod* who imprisoned *Peter*, dyed: he was punished of God soone after.

L. 3. Chron. *Orosius l. 7. c. 6.* *Funcl. Chron.* *Pantalion in Chron.* Act. 12.19.20.

ter he had slaine *Iames* the Apostle, and had imprisoned *Peter*, who by Gods Angell was delivered. This death of *Herod* happened the 4. of *Claudius*, who in the first yeare of his reigne annexed *Indea* to *Herods* government, which he held (saith *Iosephus*) fully whole three yeares, and dyed in the 4. Now in the 19. of *Tiberius*, and so to the 4. of *Claudius* (as *Bellarmine* also will haue it, allowing for *Peter* in Iewrie 5. yeares, and 7. in Antioch) is spent fully 12. yeares.

Antiq. l. 19. cap. 4. 7.

Three errours which the Papists do maintaine.

P. *By this I perceiue three errours which the Papists maintaine. First, that* Peter *planted not the Church of Antioch as it is set downe in* Eusebius *Chronologie. Secondly, that he neither was, nor could be Bishop there 7. yeares (as they say) before he went to Rome. Thirdly, that he went not to Rome (as they commonly tell the tale) in the 2. of* Claudius.

O. You haue well and truely obserued these things: for the first of these is plainely against the history of the Acts. The second can not possibly be true (seeing *Peter* departed not out of Iewrie for the first 12. yeares of *Pauls* conversion) if they will haue him 25. yeares Bishop of Rome: which impossibility *Onuphrius* finding out, he feigned a new device to make *Peter* Bishop of both places at once: and the time of both to be but 25. yeares. The third, wee see to be also an errour plainely: first from the Scripture, shewing *Peter* to be at Ierusalem in the time of the famine, which was the 4. of *Claudius*. secondly from *Bellarmines* account, who alloweth 5. and 7. yeares to be spent before *Peter* went to Rome. Now from the 19. of *Tiberius* to the 2. of *Claudius* is (as *Onuphrius* also reckoneth) full 9. yeares, 5. moneths and odde dayes (as the yeares before out of *Dion* shew vnto vs) and not 12. yeares (as *Bellarmine* supposeth) though the 19. of *Tiberius*, and the 2. of *Claudius* be included. Thirdly from this (if it be true that *Eusebius* affirmeth) that the Apostles were commanded by Christ, not to depart from Ierusalem to the end of 12. yeares, which reach to the 4. of *Claudius*, the yeare of *Peters* imprisonment and deliverance, before which time of his deliverance no approved Authour speak-

Act. 11. 19. 20. 25. 26.

Act. 11. 28. 29. and 12. 1. 3.

Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 16.

eth

eth of *Peters* going out of Iewry towards Rome, howsoeuer the 2. of *Claudius* is generally but very vnadvisedly named for the time of *Peters* going to Rome.

P. *Though he went not before, yet now he might goe thither.*

O. When he was delivered out of prison, and when Paul with *Barnabas*, were returned to Antioch againe, *Act.* 12. 25. Peter went neither to Antioch (for all the famous men there now were reckoned vp by *Luke*, *Act.* 13. 1. but no word of Peter) nor to Rome, but conveyed himselfe into some other place more secret, and retyred, than that where the Church was assembled (which prayed for him, and to whom he first came to shew himselfe) for a time, till the search made for him at the commandement of *Herod* was past, and till *Herod* was departed out of Iudea to Cesarea.

Peter went not to Rome when he was delivered from *Herod* by the Angell. Act. 12. 17.

P. *That other place in Act.* 12. 17. *they will haue, I remember, Rome it selfe.*

O. You well remember it, for so it is taken by them, but who can bee so drunke with that whorish cup, as not to see the sottishnesse of such an exposition? This was no knowen place, neither doth *Luke* in this his history vse this word place for a citie, especially so eminent: hee saith not, when one was to goe to a citie, that he went to a place. But I would heere know, whence they learned to take this other place for Rome? What expositour new or old, of learning and godlinesse did ever so interpret the same? And what reason from any one word or circumstance in the text, can leade them thereunto? If heere be meant Rome, why did not *Luke* speake plainely, and say so, as well as he named before how *Peter* was in Ierusalem, Samaria, Lydda, Ioppa, and Cesarea? durst he not name Rome heere, as he did after in Act. 19. and 23. 11. and 28? was there any danger in it? or had he a minde to keepe *Peters* going thither secret, that it might not be knowen? What shew of reason they can make for this their obscure place, that it should be Rome so imperiall a seate then, I doe not see.

The other place mentioned in the Act. 12. 17. is not Rome.

P. *Surely if they cannot bring Pope* Peter *to Rome with*

more

more pompe, but thus obſcurely, and in a cloudie ſpeech, they giue all men to vnderſtand, that their faith in this, is founded in darkeneſſe, and broached by the Prince thereof, to aduance his preſumptuous ſonne, the Romane Prelate, that man of ſinne. But I would not trouble you longer in this. Pleaſeth it you to goe on.

Act. 12. 5. and 13. 1. 2. 3. 4.

O, When *Paul* and *Barnabas*, after *Peters* deliverance, were returned to Antioch, and from thence ſent out by the holy Ghoſt into many countries, and came into many cities paſſing to and fro (which iourney is in Act. 13. and 14. Chapters, and was not finiſhed in a ſhort ſpace) yet when they came again to Antioch, they abode there a long time, till they two came vp to the Councill at Ieruſalem; in all which time *Peter* had not beene at Rome, but was at Ieruſalem, or in thoſe coaſtes; for in Act. 12. before they tooke the journey, *Peter* was at Ieruſalem, or ſome-where in *that other place*. And when they came to Ieruſalem, *Peter* was there Act. 15. 7. of whom *Luke* doth not ſpeake, as of one come from a farre off thither, to the Councill, as *Bellarmine* conceiteth from Rome, but as of one which had continued there with the Apoſtles and Elders. Now this Councill was in the 9. of *Claudius*, ſaith *Ierome*, and in the 18. of *Pauls* converſion: for *Paul* telleth of 3. yeares in Gal. 1. 17. and then of 14. Gal. 2. 1. ſpent when he went with *Barnabas* and *Titus* vp to Ieruſalem, to the Councill there (as the learned do hold, and that truely: for after this time *Paul* and *Barnabas* parted, and before this time they came but once together to Ieruſalem in the 14. of *Claudius*) ſo as it muſt be in the 18. of *Pauls* converſion, as *Luther* holdeth, and out of *Pauls* words may be concluded. And therefore for all this time, for full 17. yeares, and now going on the 18. of *Paul*, *Peter* had not beene at Rome. Yea *Calvin* ſaith, that for 20 yeares after Chriſts death, *Peter* was at Ieruſalem; which being ſo, there remaineth but 13. or 14. yeares of his life after; and then what is come of his being Biſhop at Rome 25. yeares?

Peter was not at Rome before the Councill at Ieruſalem.

Ierom. de viris illuſt. Carion in Chron lib. 3.

Funccius. chron. in comment. l. 5. Polan. in ſyllog. Theſ. theolog.

Luth. on Gal. 2. 1. 2.

Calvin. inſtit. l. 4. c. 6. ſect. 14.

P. *It can not be denyed, but of the ſhameleſly impudent, that the Papiſts faile of their time, when they ſay* Peter *went to Rome*

in

in the 2. of Claudius, *and how long he abode there, for the ſpace of 25. yeares, theſe two are plainely overthrowen. But you are not onely to proue, that he was not onely there then, nor ſo long, but that he was not there at all. Now though he were not at Rome before this Councill, hee yet might goe forthwith after thither.*

O. He was neither before the Councill there, neither did he goe thither when the Councill was ended: for wee finde that now he went from Ieruſalem to Antioch, and was there with *Barnabas* and *Paul*, who reproued him for his diſſimulation; and maketh mention of the covenant betweene them, before he came from Ieruſalem, that he ſhould goe to the Gentiles, and *Peter* to the Circumciſion, as it now ſeemeth that he did, after the Councill, to wit, to thoſe which dwelt out of Iewry, out of which , and the coaſtes therebout before this time, we reade not that he went.

Peter went not to Rome after the Councill, but to Antioch. Gal. 2.11.

P. *But how can you proue that his going to Antioch was now at this time after the Councill, and not before: for the Romaniſt* Bellarmine *will haue it before?*

O. I haue not onely learned men, as [a] *Sibrandus*, [b] *Polanus*, [c] *Pareus* and others affirming the ſame, but reaſon alſo leading me ſo to thinke. For before wee ſee that *Peter* was not out of Iewrie, and the coaſtes thereof. Againe S. *Paul* ſpeaking of their two meetings at Antioch, telleth firſt of their covenant made at Ieruſalem, which was at the *Councill*, as it is generally held, and as it muſt be taken, as before I haue ſhewed. Moreouer, when *Peter* came to Antioch, there was *Barnabas* alſo: now before the *Councill* , *Peter* could not be there with them two: for *Paul* is mentioned onely three times to haue been at Antioch before the *Councill* with *Barnabas*. The firſt time was , when *Barnabas* fetched him from Tarſus to Antioch, *Act.* 11. and then was *Peter* at Ieruſalem, *Act.* 8.1. and 11.2. The ſecond, when he and *Barnabus* went back from Ieruſalem, after that they had fulfilled their miniſterie, *Act.* 12.25 and 13.1. then was *Peter* newly delivered out of priſon, and gone into *that other place*, *Act.* 12.17. which if it were Rome, as ſome of them

Reaſons proouing *Peter* to haue beene at Antioch after the Councill, and not before.

[a] *de Papa Rom.*
[b] *de regimine eccl. parte* 2.
[c] Comment. on Rom. c. 16.
Chytreus in Chron.
Gal. 2.

Gal 2.11.13. *Paul* 3 times at Antioch before the councill: but *Peter* not there with him any of theſe times.

them say, it can not be that *Peter* was then at Antioch, and that he was not then there, the principall persons (as before is noted) which were with the Church then, are particularly named, but *Peter* is not mentioned. The third time was, when he and *Barnabas* were returned out of those Regions mentioned in *Act.* 13. and 14. and were come to Antioch againe, *Act.* 14. 26. then was *Peter* at Ierusalem, *Act.* 15. 2, 7. and albeit *Paul* and *Barnabas* abode at Antioch a long time after their returne thither, *Act.* 14. 28. yet in all that space Peter came not thither; for wee reade, that when the contention was among them raised vp by certaine brethrē, which came from Ierusalem, onely *Paul* and *Barnabas* are said to oppose them, *Act.* 15. 2. and not Peter, who when they came to Ierusalem stood for them, and were against the Iewish brethren, *Act.* 15. 7. If he had beene at Antioch, would he haue beene silent? or would *Luke* not haue vouchsafed to name him? but it appeareth plainely he was not there, by this, that the Antiochians determined to send *Paul* and *Barnabas* to the Apostles which were at Ierusalem: *Peter* was found there then, and is particularly named, *Act.* 15. 2. 6. 7. And thus we see that Peter was not at Antioch before the *Councill*, but after, and that not long neither; for *Paul* and *Barnabas* fell at oddes, within short space after, and so departed one from an other. And therefore *Peters* being at Antioch must bee betweene the *Councill* at Ierusalem, and their falling out, els could not *Peter* haue them both there as hee had when hee came to Antioch, *Gal.* 2. 11. 13.

Act. 15. 39.

P. *You haue well satisfied mee in this, I pray you now goe on.*

Act. 15. 40.

O. When *Paul* departed from *Barnabas* at Antioch, and tooke with him *Sylas*, going thorow Syria and Cilicia, confirming the Churches, and trauailing into many places mentioned in *Act.* 16. and 17. till he came to Corinth *Peter* was not at Rome: for at that time *Claudius* had commanded all the Iewes to depart out of Rome. Therefore *Peter* not being there before, we may well thinke he could not be there now.

Act. 18. 2.

now. And *Bellarmine* (though he ſuppoſeth, but faiſly, that *Peter* was before this time at Rome) granteth that he at this preſent was not there, but departed thence with others vpon the Edict of *Claudius*

P. *If he was not at Rome, it will be demanded where he was then?*

O. *Peter* being come to Antioch, he was in the way towards thoſe countries, which he mentioneth in his firſt Epiſtle: and ſeeing he had covenanted to goe forth among the Iewes, and was now come abroad, it is very likely that now he went into *Aſia* and *Bithinia*, and ſo into the reſt, and I ſo thinke, not onely becauſe *Peter* was onward in his way when he was at Antioch, but alſo for that the holy Ghoſt would not let *Paul* (travailing with the decrees at that time thorow Phrygia and Galatia) goe into Aſia and Bithynia, for that *Peter* might be there, whoſe miniſterie with *Pauls* he would not vſe in the ſame places at one time, the one being the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion, the other of the Gentiles: neither (as obſerveth a learned man) did the Lord ever vſe the miniſterie of two Apoſtles together out of Iudea and the places nigh thereabout, as he did the miniſterie of *Iohn* and *Peter* in Samaria.

Peter was in Aſia, Bithinia &c. after hee went to Antioch. 1 Pet. 1.

Act. 16. 6. 7.

Kickerman in ſyſtem. theolog.

Act. 8.

P. *But ſome may perhaps ſay, that* Peter *was not in thoſe parts, though he wrote vnto the Iewes diſperſed there.*

O. It is held by many witneſſes, that *Peter* was in thoſe countries, which in his firſt Epiſtle he mentioneth, to wit, in *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Capadocia*, *Aſia* and *Bithynia*. He was alſo the Apoſtle of the Iewes, who were chiefly in thoſe parts of the world diſperſed, as we may reade in the Acts; for in almoſt every city there, were Synagogues of the Iewes, and therefore, no doubt *Peter* would go thither in hope to find fruite of his miniſterie. And he wrote from Babylon, which muſt be either that which is called now in Egypt, the *grand Cayre*, or that in Chaldea anciently called *Babilon*, whereabout the Iewes alſo inhabited after the captivity, as wee reade in the booke of Eſther, and where alſo they continued to thoſe times, as *Ioſephus* recordeth. And *Peter* writing his

Euſeb. l. 3. c. 1. 2. Dorotheus in ſynopſ. Ierom. in viris illuſt. Origen in Gen. 3. tom. Niceph lib. 2. cap. 35. Sophron. Hieroſol. de certam. Petri. Platina in vita Petri. Mantuan. lib. 6. faſtorum.

Ioſ. Ant. l. 18. 12.

2 Pet.3.1.1.16. his second Epistle to the same persons in those places saith thus, *We made knowen vnto you the power and comming of our Lord Iesus Christ*, implying his being there among them. And what should move him, the Apostle of the Circumcision to write more specially to these, and to be so carefull of them, as he sheweth himselfe to be in 2 Epistle, ca. 1. 12. 13. 14. 15. and 16 verses? but that he was among them, and had seene the Lords effectuall worke in his ministerie towards them?

P. *I did make this obiection, though I know not any which doe deny* Peters *being in those countries, because you might fully proue euery thing, lest any might peradventure stumble therat, more of curiositie, than of necessitie, whom now your reasons may satisfie. Well, you haue shewed where* Peter *was, and that he had not beene at Rome. I long to see how you can proceede in the rest.*

When *Paul* was at Corinth *Peter* was not at Rome. Act. 18.19.20. 21.22.23.

O. While *Paul* abode at Corinth, which was a yeare and sixe moneths; and when he went thence to Ephesus, the first time, and after to Cesarea, then to Ierusalem, and after that to Antioch againe, and so ouer all the countries of Galatia and Phrygia, till his second returne to Ephesus, where hee abode three yeares, (and thus we see many yeares spent, almost fiue yeares in two places, besides so much as was spent in the other Cities and countries heere named) *Peter* might be in those parts still, because in his very last dayes, when he was nigh his death he was in Babilon. And it may be about this time, within these yeares, hee was at Corinth, for it is held that he was there, as *Dyonisius* words cited by *Eusebius* giveth vs to vnderstand, and so thinketh *Baronius*, and it must be, if it was at all. Within this time of *Pauls* leaving Corinth, and his writing to them his first Epistle from Ephesus (in which space also *Apollos* came to Corinth) because in it he nameth *Peter* and *Apollos*. But if any thinke otherwise concerning *Peters* not being at Corinth, though he be named in *Pauls* Epistle, I will not contend for this, whether he was there or no: at Rome he was not: for after his being in Asia, and the other countries, we finde him, by the

1 Pet.5.13.
2 Pet.1.14.
Euseb.l.2.ca.14.
Annal.Chri.57. Petri 13.
1 Cor.16.8.9. 19.& 15.32.

the witnesse of his owne Epistle neere his death in Babilon farre from Rome, and by that which remaineth to be delivered, it will more fully appeare, that yet *Peter* had not beene at Rome.

P. *I shall be glad to see you give further strengthning to this.*

O. When *Paul* was his last time at Corinth, where and when he wrote his epistle aforehand to the Romans, *Peter* was not at Rome.

When Paule did write to to the Romãs Peter was not at Rome.

P. *When, I pray you, was this Epistle written to the Romans?*

O. It was, first when the Iewes had libertie to be againe at Rome, for *Aquila* and *Priscilla* were returned againe thither, *Rom.* 16.3. compared with *Act.* 18.2. vnder *Nero* in the seauenth yeare, or thereabouts, as the Chronologie sheweth. Secondly, when *Paul* had so preached the Gospell in those parts, as he had no more place there, *Rom.* 15.23. Thirdly, when he had taken leaue of the Ephesians, and told them that they should see his face no more. *Act.* 20. Fourthly, when hee was iourneying vp the last time to Ierusalem with the benevolence of the Churches of the Gentiles. *Rom.* 15.25. which he had appointed to bee gathered in the assemblies. 1. *Cor.* 16.1. Fiftly, and lastly, when hee himselfe determined, after he had beene at Ierusalem to goe to Rome. *Act.* 19.21. Then was this Epistle written.

Par. on Rom. 16. this hee saith, hee hath proued to his auditors to be about the 8 of Nero.

P. *It may seeme by this to be but a few, about fiue yeares before his death. But how proue you by this Epistle that* Peter *was not then at Rome?*

O. I proue it by many reasons, First, because *Paul* often desired to come vnto them, to the end hee might establish them, which needed not, if *Peter* had beene there. For *Peter* had beene as able to confirme them, as to plant them in Christ: he that could plant them as an Apostle, could water as an Apollos or Pastour. Secondly, because *Paul* saith in the same Epistle, that he avoided this, not to build vpon another mans foundation (that is, where any Apostle had taught before, to whom the worke of the foundation is giuen, *Eph.* 2.20. as chiefe master builders they laid the foundation, and others builded thereon. 1. *Cor.* 3.10. for otherwise

Rom. 1.11. 13. Reasons prouing Peter not at Rome when Paule wrote to the Romans. Rom. 15.20.

wise he did exercise his ministerie and Apostolicall authoritie, where other had taught, as we see in Antioch. *Act.* 11. 21. 24. 26. and Ephesus *Act.* 18. 24. & 19. 1. nor to boast in another mans line of things made ready to his hand as hee saith to the Corinthians: but if *Peter* had beene at Rome & there planted the Church (as Papists dreame) then had *Paul* desired to doe, what he wrote hee did ever avoid, to build vpon another mans foundation, and to boast of that made ready to his hand, which contrarietie we may not thinke to be in *Paul*, and that in one and the same Epistle, *Rom.* 1. 11. 13. & 15. 20. Thirdly, He saluteth many of note, and not only beleeuers of the Gentiles, but of the Iewes also, as *Aquila* and *Priscilla* come againe to Rome, so *Andronicus* and *Iunia* Pauls kinsmen of note among the Apostles, these and many other to the number of 24 or thereabouts, both men and women: but not one word of *Peter*, not onely of note among the Apostles as *Andronicus* and *Iunia* were, but an Apostle, the prince of the Apostles, the Churches Monarch, and Vicar of Christ, as the blind Papists will haue him. Had *Paul* forgotten him? How could hee then remember all the rest, so farre inferiour to *Peter*. Did *Paul* envy *Peters* honor? How could such an evil rest in the bosome of so good a man? Was it pride in Paul disdaining to make mention of him? Why did he not neglect others? And did not Paul once take a iourney to see Peter at Ierusalem? No; no, it was not in Paul any forgetfulnesse, nor pride, nor envy, but the cause was, saith *Bellarmine*, for that he was not there. No, say the Rhemists, it was because Paul wrote vnto Peter private letters, and therefore would not name him in the publike. But how vntrue *Bellarmine* his supposition of Peters being at Rome is, is here proued: and till the Rhemists shew how they knowe that Paul wrote to Peter privat letters, & what became of them, I will leaue to giue answer farther to their dreame. Fourthly, the difference which was among the Christians then, when Paul wrote, about eating and not eating, about obseruing of daies, & not obseruing them, with other defects & errors among them which the Apostle touch-

2. Cor. 10. 16.

Act. 18. 2.

cheth

cheth, telleth vs that Peter was not there: for could not the Christs vicar, prince Peter the Apostle haue reformed the? Or did he neglect such things, that Paul needed to write of them? Or were they such matters as Peter held good, as now the Romanists doe? Why then doth Paul finde fault? Or did Peter iudge them things indifferent, & so peaceably passed them over? Why was Paul then so busie to intermeddle? He was a factious fellow perhaps, else he would not haue beene wiser then Pope Peter to find fault with any thing in his Diocesse. To these may be added that which *Bellarmine* (as before I haue noted) saith, which is, that Peter was not now there when Paule wrote, but was gone away by reason of *Claudius* decree, but hee cannot tell whether: Hee sendeth him from Rome: but bringeth him not at this time backe againe: yet was *Aquila* and *Priscilla* returned, what might withhold Peter from his charge? Was it feare? Or want of loue? To say either, were vntrue of such an Apostle. The truth is Rome was not Peters place, he had not beene there, neither now was there, as *Bellarmine* granteth, and I take for truth.

P. *So may you well, for if* Peter *had now beene at Rome,* Paul *would not so haue desired to come to teach them, nor would haue omitted to salute him, nor would haue so written vnto them, neither needed he so to haue done: and therefore we may beleeue he was not there at this time. But hee might goe betweene this and Pauls going to Rome during the time that* Paul *abode prisoner at Cesarea, which was full two yeares and somewhat more.* Rom. 16. 3.

O. When Paul, after the writing of this Epistle did leaue *Asia*, and all those parts, and came vp to Ierusalem, where he was taken prisoner, and from thence sent vnto Cesarea to *Felix*, which all happening in the same yeare that hee wrot this Epistle, which was in the seauenth of *Nero*. For *Cumanus* may seeme to be put out betweene the tenth and eleauenth of *Claudius*, and before the twelfth was *Felix* sent in his roome to rule, who either in or after the twelfth did marrie *Drusilla* his wife: vnder this *Felix*, was *Paul* brought to Cesarea, and there pleaded for himselfe, who saith of *Felix*.

Peter was not at Rome while Paule was prisoner in Cesarea. Act. 20. 21. & 22. 13. to 27.

In comment on Rom. 16. *Ioseph. antiq. lib. 20. cap. 5.* Act. 24. 10.

lix that hee had beene *many yeares* a Iudge to that nation. Now from the very beginning of the twelfth of *Claudius* to his death is but two yeares & odde months; therefore must the Epistle to the Romans, and *Pauls* answer before *Felix* being in the same yeare, be some yeares within the raigne of *Nero*. Even so many yeares as may make two yeares & certaine months to bee called *many yeares*, as Paul speaketh: Now many are more then one, as wee may see in *Act.* 21. where in verse 4. it is said that they tarried at Tyrus 7 daies, but in Cesarea, vers. 10. *many daies*, if thus we may speake of yeares, then *many* can bee no lesse then 9 or 10. if they bee not extended farther, as sometime they be, *Act.* 24. 17. and if so, then stood *Paul* in the seauenth yeare, at the least of *Nero* before *Felix*, vnder whom in prison hee did continue full two yeares, till *Portius Festus* came in, and then vnder him till towards winter, and then was he sent prisoner towards Rome, which was by this account towards the tenth of *Nero*, and all this time *Peter* had not beene at Rome.

P. *How proue you that?*

Reasons shewing that *Peter* had not beene at Rome while *Paul* abode in Cesarea.

O. First, because at *Pauls* taking in Ierusalem before he was conuaied to Cesarea, the Lord that night stood by him and told him, that as there he had borne witnesse of him, so should he doe at Rome, as being the only chosen man, and indeed the Apostle of the Gentiles to set out his name in the chiefe citie of the Gentiles. What needed his testimonie if *Peter* had beene there from the second of *Claudius*? And where can it be found, that the Lord sent two so renowned Apostles, or where is it recorded in any true historie, that they should be in one citie together, so farre remote from Iewry, to beare witnes of his name? If any doe alledge Authours for these two, to be at Rome together, it is the thing in question, and also whether their witnes thereof be true. Secondly because *Paul*, when he came to Rome, found the Iewes, even the chiefe of them very ignorant of Christ and his Gospell, calling it a sect, and that they heard it ill spoken off every where, but knew not what it was, and therfore desired to heare of him what he thought of it and a day being

Act. 28. 22.

ing

ing appointed *many* came, not one as yet a beleever, for its laid, when they heard him, some of them beleeved, and other did not beleeue. Now can we thinke, if *Peter* had bin there, he being the Apostle of the Iewes, that he would haue neglected them, and haue suffred them to liue so ignorant of Christ till Pauls cumming thither? or may we think that he taught them? But they were obstinate: then why were they willing to heare Paul what hee could say of that way, of which they professed themselues to be as yet ignorant?

P. *This one reason is of it selfe sufficient to perswade any man not wilfully bent to his owne will, to thinke that Peter had not beene at Rome before Pauls comming thither: and with this could I willingly set downe and here end for desiring any moe perswasions, but that I knowe you are not yet come to your full period in this point, and therefore goe on, if you please.*

Peter had not been at Rome before Paules comming thither.

O. When Paul came prisoner to Rome Peter was not there, for the brethren came to meet him at *Apij forum*: but no newes there of Peter. Perhaps he was, as Popes bee, busie with his conclaue of Cardinalls in making Canons for the Church, and shewing what power hee had to excommunicate kings, to depose them, to set men on worke to poison, stab, or any way to kill them; and if no other meanes will doe it, to blowe them & the whole state of their kingdomes vp at once with gunpowder. Againe when hee had beene 3 daies in Rome, and had called together the chiefe of the Iewes, Peter appeared not either among the brethren, nor among the Iewes. Lastly, sometime after the Iewes being againe assembled to heare Paul, yet Peter cannot bee seene, nor heard of among them.

Peter not at Rome when Paul came prisoner thither. Act. 28. 15. 17. 23.

P. *If Peter had beene there, he would haue shewed himselfe except a Popes pride had possessed him; but then I doubt not but that Pauls humilitie would haue sought out Peter to haue seen him if he had beene in Rome; they would surely haue met, and their meeting Luke would haue recorded here, as well as in other places.*

O. Who can thinke otherwise? but how could Luke write that which was not? or Peter appeare & not be there?

Peter not at Rome in the time that Paul

abode there, and when hee wrot 6 Epistles frō thence whereof one was a little before his death. Act. 28. 30.

and as hee was not at Rome when Paul came thither, so for the two yeares space of his abode there, in his owne hired house, the end whereof was shortly before his death, Peter was not there.

P. *Whence prone you this?*

O. From Lukes silence not making any mention of Peters either comming to or being at, or going all that time from Rome. And also from the Epistles of S. Paul, which hee in the space of these yeares wrote from Rome, which were these; to the *Galathians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*, *Philemon*, and 2. to *Timothy*.

P. *I pray you shew me your reasons out of euery one of them, in order one after another, and first out of the Epistle to the Galathians, that Peter was not then at Rome.*

Reasons out of the Epistle to the Galathians.

O. First, because Paule in this Epistle mentioneth Peter fiue times, and how they two were together both at Ierusalem and Antioch: but not a word of his now being at Rome; and yet the occasion of the Epistle, the matter therein contained, and the businesse he had with the false Apostles did necessarily tie him to haue spoken of Peters being at Rome, and to haue ioined him with him, if hee had beene there, either in the salutation, or valediction. Secondly, because Paul equalleth himselfe with Peter, and in naming other Apostles, setteth Iames before him. Had hee beene now at Rome, and there (if he was there) prince of the Apostles, and Christs Vicar in earth (as Papists dreame) would Paul haue so written?

P. *If Peter had beene then at Rome, Paule could as easily haue written of his being there, as of their being together at Ierusalem, and Antioch; and if hee had beene there in so high authoritie aboue all, Paul neither would or could haue denied that respect which was due to him, which herein hee neglecteth, placing Iames before him, yea in ranking Iames, Peter, and Iohn, as three in like authoritie and esteeme, and himselfe not vnequall to them. And therefore by this wee see that Paul knewe of no such preheminence in Peter as Papists boast off, and also that Peter was not now at Rome. How prone you this out of the Epistle to the Ephesians?*

O. Be-

O. Becauſe Paul ſpeaketh there of Chriſt the head of the Church, how he was the chiefe corner ſtone, the foundatiō laid by the Prophets and Apoſtles, alſo how hee did aſcend, and gaue gifts vnto men, ſome to be Apoſtles, ſome Euangeliſts, Paſtours and Doctors, and that there was but one faith, one baptiſme, one Lord, and one Church ſubiect vnto Chriſt. From all whence hee had right good occaſion to ſpeake of the miniſteriall head, of his Vicar generall S. Peter: If Peter had beene then there, and that hee had knowne any ſuch truth of God concerning Peter. But Paul is mute in this, which yet he neither could nor would haue concealed, had Peter beene ſo, for the truthes ſake, for the ordinance of Chriſt, & the reuerence which he would haue borne thereto and for the ſalvation of Chriſts flocke depending therevpon. For he that kept nothing backe of the whole Councell of God frō the Epheſians, to acquit himſelfe of their blood, as he himſelfe ſpeaketh, he would not now haue hidden this truth from them. And therefore ſeeing he ſpeaketh of Chriſt the head, and of no miniſteriall head, or Vicar generall: of officers in the Church Apoſtles and others, and of no prince like Pope; of the Catholike Church of Chriſt, but not of any Roman Catholike Church, it is cleere that Paule knewe none of theſe to be any part of Gods counſell. And therefore the Pope may get himſelfe packing hēte out of Chriſts Church, as none of Chriſts officers, nor any ſucceſſour of S. Peter, who (bleſſed man) never perked vp ſo high, nor ever came within Rome walls to claime ſuch honour.

Reaſons out of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, Eph. 1. 21. 22. & 2. 20. & 4

Act. 20. 27.

P. *Oh, how this cutteth to the heart thus Romane cauſe? Except we would haue Paul to be guiltie of blood, theſe things deuiſed by Papiſts vpon Peter for the Pope are none of Gods counſell, to be revealed to his Church. But now to the next Epiſtle: how proue you that Peter was not at Rome out of the Epiſtle to the Philippians?*

O. Becauſe Paule ſaith therein, that hee had then none like minded to them as was Timothie: what not Peter the chiefe paſtour, if he then had beene there? ſhould the loue & care of Timothie tō the Saints haue beene preferred before his,

Reaſons out of the Epiſtle to the Philippians. Phil. 2. 19. 20.

his, that was appointed (as they say) next vnder Christ, by Christ himselfe to take care of all? Againe S. Paul mentioneth the salutation of the brethren to the Philippians, and of all the Saints, but chiefly them of *Cesars* household, but no salutation from Peter. Would Paule neither name him with the brethren, nor with the Saints, nor with those of *Cesars* household? Did Paul make knowen to these how he would send their commendations to the Philippians, and would he not tell Peter thereof? or did Paul presume of all their well-wishings to the Philippians, and so wrote their commendations of his owne head? and durst he not vndertake as much for Peter if he had beene there?

S. Paul in this Epist. nameth Clement one of Peters successours (as they say) and yet not a word of Peter.

P. *If Peter had been at Rome, Paul would haue done the one or the other: but this giueth vs to knowe that Peter was not at Rome. What reason haue you out of the Epistle to the Colossians?*

O. Because in it Paule telleth them that then *onely* three which were of the circumcision *Aristarchus* his fellowprisoner *Marke* and *Iesus* called *Iustus* were his fellow helpers to the kingdome of God. Where was then Peter the Apostle of the circumcision? Might not he be held a fellow-helper to the kingdome of God? And must *Marke* the scholler be remembred, and the master S. Peter not worthie to bee made mention off, if he then had beene at Rome?

Reasons out of the Epistle to the Coloss. c. 4. 10. 11.

P. *It cannot to me seeme credible: haue you any thing to say out of the Epistle to Philemon?*

O. Yea, thus much from thence, that Peter was not at Rome, because S. Paul in it nameth his fellow prisoner *Epaphras*, and then his fellow-laborers, *Marke* againe, *Aristarchus*, *Luke*, and *Demas:* but no word of Peter, either as a fellow prisoner, or a fellow laborer among them; and all these salute *Philemon*, so doth not S. Peter. Yea, Paul in the forefront of the Epistle ioineth with him Timothie, was not Peter more worthie then he, if he had beene then at Rome?

Reasons out of the Epistle to Philemon.

P. *I see your reasons very good out of these Epistles that Peter was not then at Rome: but these being written some time before his second appearing, and so the last before* Nero, *for wee*

read

read of no more: Peter might come iumpe to the ſlaughter, when Paul was ready to be offered.

O. When *Paul* was brought the ſecond time (and ſo the laſt as you ſay) before *Nero*, when *Demas* had now forſaken him, when he had finiſhed the courſe of his miniſtery, being now ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand, of all which *Paul* maketh mention in his ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, the laſt which he wrote from Rome, *Peter* was not there. For in that Epiſtle *Paul* telleth *Timothie*, that at his firſt anſwere *no man ſtood with him, but all forſooke him.* Will they haue *Peter* at Rome, and *Paul* to make this complaint againſt him? for if he were there, *Paul* doth not except him, nor any other, but ſheweth by the negative and the affirmative, that he was wholly left alone. At his ſecond anſwere he ſaith, that *onely Luke* was with him, and therefore not *Peter*. Againe the Apoſtle in this Epiſtle mentioneth theſe which were gone from Rome, as *Creſcens*, *Titus*, *Tychicus*, beſides the backſliding *Demas*; and theſe which then were at Rome, when he wrote this Epiſtle to *Timothy*, as *Eubulus*, *Pudens*, *Claudia*, and among the reſt *Linus*, whom the Papiſts will haue *Peters* immediate Succeſſour, and *Peter* is not named, either as one departed from Rome, or as one then there. What may we thinke of this? Would *Paul* in two Epiſtles before haue made mention of *Marke*, *Peters* ſcholler, and heere of *Linus* his firſt Succeſſour, and of *Clement* an other Succeſſour, and never ſo much as mention *Peter*, if he alſo had beene there? What other reaſon can be giuen then this, but that he was not at Rome?

When Paul was ready to be offered, and his departing at hand, Peter was not at Rome.

2 Tim. 4.

Platina in vita Pont. Rom.

Euſeb. lib. 3. cap. 4.

Phil. 4 3.

Euſeb. lib. 3. cap. 14.

P. *If he was not at Rome, ſoneere the death of* Paul, *it will be demanded where he was?*

Peter nigh his owne & Pauls death, was at Babylon, farre from Rome.

O. Surely farre enough from Rome, euen at *Babilon*: for from thence he wrote his firſt Epiſtle, and not vnlike his ſecond alſo, or from ſome place in thoſe parts. Now that he was there, about the time of *Pauls* death and his owne too, it appeareth by this, that *Paul* in his laſt Epiſtle ſaith, that *his departure* was at hand, and S. *Peter* in his laſt Epiſtle ſaith that *he was to put off* ſhortly this earthly Tabernacle; which

1 Pet. 5. 13. as Broughton doth prove frō the word Bo-ſor, 2 Pet. 2. 14

2 Tim. 4. 6.

2 Pet. 1. 14.

ſpeech telleth vs, that both were nigh death, and both as far alunder as Babilon and Rome; in which ſeverall parts of the world, it is moſt likely they ſuffered martyrdome; the one among the Iewes, who moſt inhabited thoſe parts, as the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion, and the other among and in the chiefe City of the Gentiles. And thus you ſee by this peregrination of S. *Paul*, that *Peter* was never at Rome, which I hold to be true, and doe wiſh others ſo to thinke, till our adverſaries can bring as good and as many reaſons to prove him to haue beene there, as I haue now brought to proue him never to haue bin there. Yet if you pleaſe to object any thing, which you thinke may be objected, I do intreat you to do it, to giue more full ſatisfaction if it may be.

P. *So am I determined to doe; but I pray you before, doe ſo much as ſumme together briefly all the reaſons which you haue given, to prove* Peter *not to haue beene at Rome, for my better conceiving of the force of all together.*

O. This is well thought of, and I ſhall willingly grant your requeſt, becauſe my meaning is not, that men ſhould take one or two, or ſome moe of theſe reaſons for a ſufficient proofe by themſelues, but altogether as twiſted one in an other, not to be diſſevered; and as the forces of many vnited in one to make good that for which they are brought, againſt the weake oppoſition of all the adverſaries of the truth, and the vndermining of counterfeite friends. This therefore is the ſummarie collection of all into one.

The ſumme of all the reaſons together, proving that Peter was never at Rome.

If the time when he is firſt ſaid to goe to Rome, be found falſe; if his iourneying thither ſet out, be worthy no credit; if his Epiſcopall juriſdiction, and planting of the Church at Antioch, from whence he is ſaid to come to ſeate himſelfe at Rome, be an vntruth, flat againſt Scripture; if the revelation of his tranſlation be fabulous; if the time of his ſo long being at Rome can not poſſibly bee true; if they haue no word of God for it, but that it is in many things againſt it; if it be not agreeable to the covenant made betweene him and S. *Paul*; if the end for which hee is ſaid to go to Rome be a very fiction; if it can not be truely proved, no not by a-

ny

ny probable reaſons; if ſuch as ſeeke to defend it, can not by any ſolid arguments maintaine it, if ſuch as firſt broached it, were not worthy credit, and all other writing thereof deceived; if he was never there all the life-time of S. *Paul*, with whom they ſay he was martyred the ſame day and yeare; if that which is written of his death there, be a fooliſh dreame; if the reaſons againſt his being there be ſuch as can not bee anſwered ſoundly without cavilling and ſophiſticall evaſions, wee may well thinke that *Peter* was never at Rome. This is the ſumme of the reaſons. Now let me heare what you can obiect.

This is made cleare in the objections & anſwers after.

P. *Truly theſe things being ſo, I can obiect nothing as from my ſelfe, I am ſo fully ſatisfied. But what I ſhall obiect, it is either that which I haue heard out of the mouth of* Pſeudodoxus *and* Pſeudocatholicus, *or read out of bookes.*

O. Obiect, I pray you, what you now can remember, even any thing of moment, which either you haue read or heard obiected.

P. *They will ſay, all your reaſons are onely concluded negatively, and therefore not ſound. For what if he went not to Rome in the 2 of* Claudius, *nor 3. nor 4. can you ſay he went not at all? What if they erre in the number of his 25 yeares, being at Rome? will it follow that he was not there at all, becauſe it can not be proved that he was there ſo long? And what if the Scripture doe not ſay that he was there: was he not therefore there?*

O. I anſwere. Firſt, they wrong vs in this; wee doe not thus argue, you ſee I haue given very many reaſons againſt *Peters* being at Rome, and doe not thus weakely conclude from one or two circumſtances, but from all theſe things afore named together. Secondly, to conclude negatively from Scripture in matters which concerne faith and Religion, is good and ſound; as thus: No word of God doth tell vs that *Peter* was at Rome; therefore we are not to beleeue him to haue beene there, though never ſo many affirme it. Thirdly, I doe not reaſon from a meere ſilence of the Scriptures in this, but from them firſt, as they ſhew plainly where

Sibrandus de Papa Rom. ca. 3. Whitak. de Pont. Rom. cont. 4. q. 3.

How we reaſon from the Scriptures, & what ſtrength they do afford vs againſt Peters being at Rome.

Peter

Peter was for many yeares together, in which he could not be at Rome; and ſecondly as they doe afford vnto vs many arguments againſt his being there at all, which two together are as much in effect, as if the Scriptures had ſaid, that *Peter* was not there, and may well be oppoſed againſt all the bare affirmations of men, and againſt the fabulous narrations of all our adverſaries.

P. *You perhaps thinke they onely reſt vpon the ſayings of men, but that is not ſo; for they goe about to prove* Peter *to be at Rome, out of the firſt Epiſtle of S.* Peter *in theſe words,* The Church that is at Babylon ſaluteth you: *where* Bellarmine *by Babylon vnderſtandeth Rome, and ſaith that* Papias *and* Ierome *doe ſo take it, and ſo is Babylon taken in the Revelation by all of vs; what ſay you to this?*

1 Pet.5.13.

O. I anſwere: Let them expound the name Babylon as they pleaſe; it will not ſerue their turne; for taking it figuratively (as they doe very fooliſhly) then it can not prove that, for which they bring it, to make their ſtorie of *Peters* being at Rome true. For ſaith *Pareus*, by an Allegorie an hyſtorie can not bee proved. And if it bee taken literally, then it is nothing to their purpoſe as they well know.

Par. on Rom. 16.

Babylon in 1 Pet.5.13. is to be taken literally.

P. *In which ſenſe is it to be taken ſay you?*

O. In the literall ſenſe, euen for the citie Babylon. Firſt, Becauſe, as ſaith *Iunius* and *Kickerman*, and that truely. Heere is an hyſtoricall and not a typicall narration. Secondly, becauſe *Peter* writeth an Epiſtle, and therein according to the manner of Epiſtles, ſpeaketh of places properly. Thirdly, It is acknowledged that *Peter* preached in Babylon, as *Methodius* an ancient Biſhop and hyſtorian, alledged by *Marianus Scotus* affirmeth: now, ſeeing there was ſuch a Citie, in which *Peter* did preach, properly ſo called, we are ſo to take it, except the circumſtances of the text enforce it otherwiſe, which heere they doe not.

Junius contra Bellarmin. Kickerman in ſyſt. 1 og plen. parte 2. Rain. ag. Hart cap. 6. diviſ. 3. Ioſeph. Antiq. l. 18. cap 12. Iohan. Rauw. in Coſmogra. Renec. in panop. tom. 4. p. 13.

P. *And why can it not not be taken figuratively?*

Babylon in 1 Pet.5.13. can not be taken figuratively.

O. Firſt, becauſe there is no neceſſitie, nor any reaſon for it out of the text, why any ſhould ſo take it. Secondly, becauſe *Peter* is vnderſtood to ſpeake properly of all other

places

places mentioned in his Epistle, as in cap. 1.1. Thirdly, for that it is the vsuall manner in writing Epistles, to speake properly both from whence men doe write, and whither; els, how can they be vnderstood where they be, who doe write, and to whom they doe write. Fourthly, because S. *Paul* writing his Epistles from any place, is vnderstood alwayes properly without a figure, and nameth Rome plainely, which was at yet not called Babylon by any penman of Gods Spirit, neither so vnderstood of any; for *Iohn* had not at this time written his Revelation, in which Babylon is put for Rome. Lastly, because this groundlesse exposition is made the onely ground to make *Peter* walke to Rome vpon, which we may see to be but a feigned storie, the exposition is not made good from the text, neither can be, but is devised to strengthen a fable, and therefore not to be admitted.

P. *We may easily see the absurdity of the interpretation, & and with all the folly of the Romish Clerkes, who vnnecessarily will from hence, by the authoritie of S.* Peter, *brand Rome with such a name of abomination; for by making Rome Babylon, they make it the great Whore, that damned strumpet, which with their Pope shall goe into vtter destruction, of which all Gods people are to take heed, and are commanded by the Lord therefore to depart from that Egyptian, Sodomiticall, and Babylonish dominion and power. But what say you to* Bellarmines *reasons for the interpretation?* Rev.17. Rev.18. & 11. 8.

O. His reasons haue no force in them. For the first reason standeth thus. What interpretation *Papias* and *Ierome* giue, is true; but thus they interprete this place; therefore the exposition is good and true. The major part is not sound except we beleeue them to bee Popes sitting in Saint *Peters* Chaire, and so could not erre. *Ierome* was a learned man, but all is not Gospel which he hath written; and this which heere he deliuereth, he speaketh from *Papias*, as a learned man avoucheth. And as for this *Papias*, his iudgement and bare exposition of a place without proofe, is of no estimation; for that he was a man, as *Eusebius* saith, of small iudgement, Bellarmines two reasons, to proue Babylon in 1 Pet. 5. 13. to be Rome, answered. Rainolds ag. Hart, ca. 6. divil. 3. *Whitak. de Pont. Rom. cont. 4. q. 3. cap. 2. Euseb. l. 3. ca. 39.*

ment, as his writings shew, in which are things incredible, strange Parables, and doctrines of our Saviour, such things as be more like fables, then true stories; and he was the Authour of the Chiliasts; what account is then to be made of an erroneous and fabling Commentatour? Touching *Bellarmines* second reason, to haue Babylon to be heere Rome, because it is so vnderstood and taken in the Revelation; I say it is silly and weake. For, frame his reason, which either must be thus: Every Babylon in Scripture is Rome; which generall proposition is very false, as we may see in *Ieremies* Prophecie; or thus. *Some Babylon* in Scripture is Rome, which being a particular exposition in this kind, produceth not a necessarie conclusion. In the Revelation, Babylon is expounded to be Rome, *ergo*, heere it is so in this Epistle of Saint *Peter* to be taken; It followeth not; for there the circumstances from the text, and the exposition of the Holy Ghost himselfe maketh Babylon to be Rome, but nothing so heere. But many reasons there are to prove the contrary. Againe, *Iohn* speaketh as a Prophet mystically of Rome, calling it Babylon; so doth not *Peter* heere. And therefore though Babylon be Rome in the Revelation, yet it is not so in the place of S. *Peter*. What can you further obiect?

P. *Thus reasoneth further euen that learned man* Bellarmine. *When* Paul *came to Rome, there were many Christians, and so the Gospell was preached before, and who must found the Church there, and make these Christians but* Peter, *seeing none other can be named?*

Bellarmine erreth heere in three things.

O. By this wee may obserue, that *Bellarmine* holdeth 3 things. First, that *Peter* was at Rome before *Paul*, which is not true, as by my former reasons I haue shewed, to wit, that he was neither before *Paul*, nor yet after his comming thither, for he was not there at all. Secondly, that *Peter* was the first that preached the Gospel at Rome, and there made Christians, and planted the Church. This is as true, as his planting first the Church at Antioch. Doe they not all bring *Peter* to Rome in the 2 of *Claudius*? and is it not manifest out of Gods word, by the history of the Acts, and from the

Peter preached not the Gospel first at Rome.

the Galathians, chap. 1. and 2. that he was both till then and after in Ieruſalem and Iewrie? Yet is it proved by the learned men *Iunius* and *Whitaker*, by *Sibrandus* and by *Mornew*, that in the reigne of *Tiberius*, which was before both *Caligula* and *Claudius*, there were Chriſtians in Rome, and for this they cite *Tertullian* in his Apologeticum *cap.* 5. *Oroſius lib.* 7. *Euſeb.* his Chron. *Anno Chriſti* 38. and in his Eccleſiaſticall hyſtorie *lib.* 2. *cap.* 2.3. *Marianus Scotus in Chronicis*, *Platina* vpon the life of our Saviour, towards the end: and *Clemens in* 6. *conſtit. Apoſtolicarum*, *ca.* 9. And therefore *Peter* could not be the firſt planter of the Goſpell at Rome, whither no doubt preſently vpon the death of Chriſt, the fame of Chriſt went; for in ſhort ſpace it paſſed abroad into many countries and kingdomes, as we may finde by the hyſtorie of the Acts, and the witnes of men. *Euſeb. l.* 2. *cap.* 3. *Niceph. l.* 2. *ca* 8.

Thirdly, this learned Cardinall doth belike hold, that none other can be named, or more truely imagined the firſt preacher there, but *Peter*; but he may know if he will, that *Clement* and *Dorotheus* doe name *Barnabas*; and *Tertullian* ſpeaketh of *Iohns* preaching there, as the Archbiſhop of *Spalato* citeth him. And truly many may be imagined better than *Peter* to haue beene firſt at Rome; becauſe firſt the Scripture tyeth *Peter* to Iewrie for many yeares. Secondly, becauſe there were other Apoſtles beſides him, and none of them named as abiding in Iewry, ſaue *Iames* the Lords brother, the other *Iames* and *Iohn*, ſo long as *Peter*. Thirdly, there were 70 diſciples, yea, ſaith S. *Paul* aboue 500 brethrē, of whom at one time Chriſt was ſeene, the moſt whereof did liue vnto the time that *Paul* wrote his firſt Epiſtle vnto the Corinthians, ſome of theſe might meete together. Fourthly, there were at *Peters* firſt ſermon preached at Ieruſalem, when 3000 were converted, among the reſt *ſtrangers of Rome*; and *Paul* nameth *Andronicus* and *Iunia*, men of note among the Apoſtles before his converſion, who were at Rome, theſe might preach firſt at Rome. Laſtly, *Peter* before he went out of Iewrie, converted *Cornelius* a Romane, and many of his kinſmen and friends; hee or ſome

In lib. 1. *recog. in ſynopſi.* *Tertull. de præſcript.* *Spalatenſis l.* 4. *cap.* 1.

Many may be better imagined to haue preached firſt at Rome than Peter.

Act. 2. 10. Rom. 16. 7.

Act. 10.

of these might returne before *Peter* to preach at Rome. But to leaue conjectures, what if none could bee named? would it follow that therefore it should needes be *Peter*?

P. *By no good consequent: let this obiection therefore passe: I will come to an other.* Bellarmine *saith that S.* Marke *wrote his Gospel at* Rome *from* Peters *mouth, as he heard him preach, and therefore* Peter *was there.*

O. If *Marke* saw him, and heard him at Rome, without all doubt, hee was at Rome. But first, who can tell that *Marke* did see him there? S. *Paul* saw *Marke* there, and speaketh of him, but not a word of *Peter*. Secondly, to whom did *Marke* relate this, or what approued testimony is there, that saith, hee himselfe had it from *Marke*, or from any such a one as *Marke* related this vnto? The truth is, that this tale of *Marke* is from *Papias* also, whose profound wisdome found Rome in Babylon; and by the same depth of vnderstanding doth make *Marke* his hearer there, because *Peter* writing from Babylon, nameth *Marke*: so as *Peters* being at Rome, and *Markes* writing his Gospell from him, are both alike trueth, forged out of *Papias* brain, and avouched by others; yet they agree not: for *Irenæus* saith, that *Marke* wrote his Gospell after the death of *Peter* and *Paul*; when *Ierome* and *Papias* say, hee dyed in the eight yeare of *Nero*. Thus they agree, and therefore what credit is to be given to them? haue you any moe ridiculous objections?

Whitak. lib. de Pont. Rom.

1 Pet. 5. 13.

Lib. 3. cap. 1.

Ierom in Marco de viris illust.

P. *They say that* Peter *dyed at Rome.*

O. They say so indeed; but how prove they it?

P. *Because he was buried there, there is his sepulchre, and many haue gone on pilgrimage vnto it.*

O. All this will not prove, that *Peter* dyed there; for we know by experience, in many instances, that men haue dyed in one place, & haue bin buried in an other. *Iacob* was buried in Canaan, but dyed in Egypt: *Iosias* dyed at Megiddo, and was buried in Ierusalem. Neither will a sepulchre there, prove him to haue beene buried there. As if such as feigned this fable of *Peters* being there, could not also say he

A tombe set vp in a place proueth not that he dyed there where it is erected.

hee dyed there, as the fabulous *Papias* hath done, and so some, to further the Popes authority, either imagine the tombe of some others, to be *Peters*, or els make one to bee his tombe. The Prince of darkenesse, and the Pope his Prince sonne, want not wit to deuise these and a thousand such trickes to delude the world with. As for pilgrimages, and the peoples running to visite his sepulchre, who knoweth not the vanity of superstition? Did not people in former times honour the sepulchre of a Saint that never was, called *Longinus*, visiting his sepulchre at *Mantua* and *Lyons*? and with the like superstitious madnesse were not the wise men which came out of the East to Christ at Bethlehem made three Kings too forsooth, and their bodies brought from the East into the West, as farre as to Millaine and Cullen, and there visited by foolishly deluded people? The folly in this kinde can not bee expressed. But what need I stand vpon this? If *Peter* was never at Rome, then he could not dye at Rome. But the former I haue proued, and therefore the latter can not be denyed. Haue you heard any thing els which may be obiected?

P. *The Cardinall yet hath a reason to proue Peters being at Rome, because he was (saith he) the Bishop of Rome.*

O. Oh the madnesse and wickednesse of men, when they desire to maintaine falshood against the truth! did not hee say (as before is noted) that one may be a Bishop, where yet he never commeth, and gaue diuers instances from Popes of Rome, which never came at Rome? How then can this argument stand? Againe, hee goeth about to proue a fabulous narration by a false tenent: for Peter neither was, nor can properly be called the Bishop of Rome, for that hee was an Apostle, and the Apostle of the circumcision, of which I haue shewed my mind before; and therefore, if you remember any other besides, let me heare it. Reade of this Iunius, Sibrandus, & Whitak.

P. *What if* Metaphrastes *who wrot of Peters iourneing to Rome be obiected?*

O. I will say with *Baronius*, that herein he is not worthy credit. *Annal. Chri. 44. Claud. 2. num. 10.*

P. *Yet you will not make light of* Linus *booke, who was Peters ſucceſſour (as they ſay) and wrot of Peters death there?*

De pont. Rom. O. I will make no lighter of it, then *Bellarmine* doth, who ſaith of it thus, *Librum hunc confictum eſſe*, and therefore to be reiected as fabulous.

P. *But what ſay you to the teſtimonie of* Clement, *alleaged by* Reyn. againſt Hart *againſt* Reynolds? *who in an old monument of his, in an* H.c.6. diviſ. 4. *Epiſtle written to Iames the Lords brother, ſaith, that Peter had him by the hand in Rome, and ordained him Biſhop there after him, in the hearing of the whole Church.*

O. I will tell you what that learned Reynolds ſaith thereof; It is (ſaith he) a very *drunken forgerie* for that in it is reported that *Peter* prayed *Clement* to write (when hee was dead) the Epiſtle to *Iames* the brother of the Lord to comfort him, whereas *Iames* was dead aboue 8 yeares before. And this he proueth out of Ioſephus and out of Euſebius.

Lib. 3. cap. 2. P. *I haue read of one* Egeſippus *an ancient writer, who relateth at large a ſtory of Peters being at Rome, and how, when Peter was departing out of Rome to ſaue his life, the Lord Ieſus met him at the gate of the citie, and hauing ſpoken to Peter did turne him backe againe; what ſay you to this?*

Euſeb. lib. 4. c. 8. 22. Trithem. deſcrip. eccleſ. Willet on Rom. c. 16. pag. 743. Carlile his diſcourſe pag. 7. O. I anſwer, 1. for the author, that he is not that true *Egeſippus* which *Euſebius* ſpeaketh off, and *Trithemius*, but another counterfeit, as is ſhewed by ſuch as haue gathered many reaſons to proue it. 2. For the narration, it cannot be true, for that it is contrary to the doctrine of S. Peter, *Act.* 3. 21. in which he taught, that after Chriſts aſcenſion, Chriſt muſt be in the heauens till his ſecond comming: how can it then be true, that Chriſt ſhould meet *Peter* at one of the gates of Rome?

P. *I well perceiue, how both inſtly, and with eaſe you can ſhake theſe off; but you knowe they haue a clowd of witneſſes, very many both of the Greeke and Latine Churches, which doe with one full agreement, affirme that Peter was at Rome, and being a matter* de facto, *we are to hold it as a thing credible, & not to reiect lightly their authoritie therein.*

O. Friend *Philalethes*, I doe not lightly reiect the authoritie

ritie of the ancient, I reverence antiquitie, and doe honour and highly esteeme of the learning and godlinesse of such holy men as haue liued in former ages, and I regard their testimonie as much, as with truth and reason I may; But yet if they giue me iust cause to question their witnesse herein, & that by diligent searching I doe finde their relation not credible, if I refuse to stand to their bare affirmation, I am not iustly to be blamed.

P. *No verily; but it will bee asked what maketh you to question their authoritie, seeing they are so many and of so great credit in the Church?*

O. You and all other may easily perceiue it; but to giue them more full satisfaction, I am drawne hereto. 1. From the force of all my former reasons prouing that Peter was never at Rome; which will weigh against mens bare words, and also presse downe the meere sayings of men. 2. I doubt whether the writings which bee cited vnder the names of those men produced for witnesses, bee their owne, or but counterfeit; and this doubt ariseth, because many misbegotten pamphlets (saith *Reynolds*) haue wandred from the very daies of the Apostles, and that vnder their names also. And it is confessed of Papists, and found true of Protestants, that there are a number of counterfeit writings vniustly fathered vpon learned men. 3. It is yet questionable (though they be their true writings) for that they may be corrupted, as most are for aduantage of the Church of Rome, and as we may well suspect them so to bee in this point, that for these reasons: because the *Monkes* had these authors in their keeping; and this matter is of such moment for the vpholding of the See of Rome, as we may easily be perswaded to think they would put in such words as might make for the same. And the great discord almost in every circumstance, which is to be found in them that write of Peters being at Rome, may giue vs to thinke, that they haue not beene well dealt withall. Lastly, although there bee neither counterfeiting, nor corrupting any of them, yet may their testimonie bee questioned, because so much Scripture and reason is against that:

Reasons why the authority of men is doubted of in this matter.

Reynolds against Hart. c. 6. diuis. 4.

See Perkins preparatiue to the demonstr. of his problem.

See D. Iames his book therof.

Pareus on Rom. 16. in the end.

that which they affirme, and but affirme only: for they perswade vs neither from Scripture, nor reason, that Peter was at Rome. We haue nothing for it but their bare words, and the authoritie of their antiquitie, and the credit of their very names to make their bare words good.

P. *Yea, and this seemeth to many to be warrant good enough to haue so many, so learned, so godly, so constantly avouching it, and that in all ages, from time to time; it being only a matter not of faith and doctrine, but of a fact and deed done, to beleeue the same.*

When and vpon what ground mens words and bare affirmations may be iudged credible.

O. I doe yeeld it them willingly, if such men as you speak of, doe speake of knowledge and from themselues, and not of bare heareſay, if that which they affirm be not called iustly into question by more credible authoritie, if they agree among themselues, and are not found vntrue in their speeches, then their witnesse should be sufficient for a matter *de facto*. But it is cleane contrary in this matter; and therefore though they be many learned, godly, and constant avouchers of Peters being at Rome; yet is their bare credit not sufficient to make it credible.

P. *I pray you shew me these things distinctly, why say you that they speake not of knowledge, and from themselues?*

Not one Author speaketh from himselfe and of knowledge, which saith that Peter was at Rome.

O. Because not one of them quoted by our adversaries, were either eye or eare witnesse of Peters being at Rome: not one of them speaketh vpon any certaine ground from Scripture, from divine revelation, from any of the Apostles, or from any approued witnes that was with Peter at Rome. And besides this, though many say thus much, yet are they indeed and truth not many, but only one witnesse. For none speake as from themselues, but by relation from others, the first author being *Papias*, of whom others tooke it, and wrot it; others receiue it from these, and credited the same without farther examination, and so it came to be commonly in time held for a truth. So then here is in shew many witnesses, and all in *Papias*, but one erring fabulous taleteller.

Many witnesses and all but one in substance.

P. *I pray you what more credible authoritie calleth their authoritie into question?*

O. Even

O. Even the word of God, which in many things convinceth them of errour, not onley of faith, but also in this matter *de facto*, as before is shewed in particular circumstances, as that Peter went to Rome in the 2 of *Claudius*, that he was Bishop at Antioch seauen yeares, that hee was at Rome 25 yeares, and that he first planted the Church at Antioch & at Rome; all which are vntruths.

The word convinceth them of errour.

P. You spoke of their discord, shew me that.

O. Discord, say you! that can I easily shew; for they almost agree in nothing. 1. Not in the *time* of Peters going to Rome. *Orosius* saith it was in the beginning of *Claudius*: *Ierome* and others in the 2 of *Claudius*. *Fasciculus temporum* in the fourth yeare. *Passional de vitis sanctorum* in the 13 year. Some other say it was in the 15 after Christs death, and so about the 6 or 7 of *Claudius*. *Damasus* saith hee went to Rome vnder *Nero*. 2. Not in the *place from whence* hee went to Rome: some say from Ierusalem to Rome, other from Antioch thither. 3. Not in the *conflict* with *Simon Magus*, of which before at large. 4. Not in the *place where* hee died, many say at Rome; but *Lyranus*, *Ierom*, *Chrysostome*, and *Glossa interlinearis* on *Mat.* 23. 34 say hee was martyred at Ierusalem. 5. Not in *the burying* of his body: Some say that one halfe of him was buried in the Church of S. Peter at Rome, and the other halfe in the Church of S. Paul, equally devided by Pope *Sylvester*; and yet others write, that onely the two heads of Peter and Paul are at Rome, & Peters neather iaw and beard are at *Poyters* in France, many of his bones at *Triers*, and his braine at *Geneva*. 6. Not in the *time of his dying*, *Iacobus de Voragine* will haue Peter to die on the same day and yeare with S. Paul. But *Ierom* though hee grant the same day, yet not the same yeare, but Paul must suffer the yeare after. *Epiphanius* saith that he died in the 12 of *Nero*; but others in the 14. 7. And lastly, *not in his successors*. Some will haue *Clement* the first; other some *Linus* Bishop of Rome after Peter; but others againe make him Bishop before his death, and say that he did dye before Peter. And thus we see that they agree not in any one circumstance.

They agree not in their witnesse.

These differences are gathered from *Whitac. Iunius, Sibrandus, Beza*, on Act. 12. Archb. of Spalat. Willet on Rom. 16. Rainag. H. cap. 6. divis. 3. *Onuphrius. Anacletus. ep. 3. Niceph. l. 14. cap. 39.*

Calvin. de reliquys.

Which place being searched, there was found onely a pumy stone.

See L. Osianders table hereof in Epit. Cent. l. 3. cap. Cent. 1.

ſtance. And therefore their bare affirmation of Peters being at Rome is not warrant enough, though it bee a matter *de facto*.

P. *It will be ſaid, though they do varie in circumſtances yet they doe all agree in this, that Peter was at Rome.*

O. A goodly agreement; he was there, ſay they, but they cannot tell when; for we finde, that when they ſay hee was there, he was not there. I ſtand vpon their failing in circumſtances, becauſe the matter is queſtionable with the moſt indifferent. Indeed when the matter is knowne to bee true; then to quarrell about circumſtances is idle contention. But now where the maine point is diſputable with ſome, & iudged but a fable with other ſome, there ſuch groſſe erring and ſuch fowle fallings out in circumſtances diſcredit the relation of a thing, and maketh it to be iudged fabulous. For hiſtories are made credible, by liuely ſetting out matters by circumſtances and by the contrary they come to bee ſuſpected.

In a matter diſputable, circumſtances may be ſtood vpon to make it not credible

P. *Well, for all this which you haue ſaid, ſome will not beleeue it to be likely, that ſo many, ſo learned, ſo godly, dwelling in divers places, and liuing in ſeverall ages ſhould ſo conſtantly avouch it for a truth, and yet be but a very fable. It will not bee held credible that they all ſhould be ſo miſtaken, ſo blinded with ſuch an errour, and not one of them at any time to perceaue it.*

O. Say what may be ſaid, I knowe indeed, that ſome wil never be perſwaded, to thinke that theſe ſhould thus erre. The wilfully obſtinate I neither indeauour, nor looke to ſatisfie: but for others I would aske them what maketh them to thinke, that theſe cannot be thus overtaken? They haue no ground for it, but this. The high eſteeme of their perſo ns their learning and pietie; and becauſe they liued many of them long ſince, and ſome of them nigh to the times of the Apoſtles, and what? If we call theſe into queſtion, in a matter *de facto*, if they which be ſo famous, ſo highly eſteemed of cannot be credited; then caſt off all hiſtorie, reject all mens authoritie; and thus they runne on, but alas, more to vphold mens credit, then to be carefull to finde out the truth; which

Why men doe thinke that ſuch ancient learned and godly men cannot bee overtaké herein.

if

if we would more reſpect then the perſons of men, men would be more careſull to take heed what they doe write; true ſtories would not be reiected, but the truth in hiſtories preſerued and fabulous tales cut off.

P. *Indeed you ſay true, for we may finde it now true by experience, that many tales and errand lies are told from one to another vpon the credit and eſteeme of them from whom men receaue the reports, which ſome lewdly faigned, & other moſt honeſt credulouſly beleeuing and relating without examination bring ſuch lies and tales into credit with many, & it is not vnlikely that thus this tale of Peters being at Rome came to be beleeued for truth. But for our better perſwaſion, can you giue any reaſons to make men thinke, that it is not vnlikely, but that ſuch as theſe, though godly and learned men might erre herein.*

How lyes come to be told for for true tales.

O. Firſt: All by nature now are apt to beleeue lyes; as we ſee our firſt Parents did in their very eſtate of innocency they credited the devill before God, and therefore it is not vnlikely that the beſt of *Adams* poſterity, borne in ſinne, may erre and beleeue an vntruth. How eaſily did *Iacob* beleeue the falſe relation of *Ioſephs* death? *Ioſua* and all the Elders of Iſraell the forged tale of the Gibeonites? *David* the ſlander of *Zibah* againſt *Mephiboſheth*? and this they did for want of examination, and becauſe they tooke it for granted, that the parties would not ſpeake an vntrueth. Theſe I produce not to taxe the Fathers of wilfully lying, as *Iacobs* children, the Gibeonites, and *Zibah* did; bee this thought farre from me; but to ſhew that this report of *Peters* being at Rome, might he forged, and they in ſimplicity of heart like *Iacobs*, *Ioſuaes* and *Davids* might credite it, & ſo broach the ſame for truth, for want of examination, and vpon a too charitable conceite of them or him from whom they heard it, or out of whoſe writings they reade it. Secondly, it is not vnlikely that herein they may erre, becauſe wee finde fabulous matters *de facto* written of theſe Ancients, and the ſame reported for trueth, as the Epiſtles of *Seneca* to *Paul*, and *Paul* to him, of *Agbarus* writing to Chriſt, and Chriſt to him. *Irenens* telleth a tale of Chriſts ſuffering

Reaſons ſhewing why it is not vnlikely that theſe Ancients haue erred in this thing.

I. Oſiander epit. cent. Rain. ag. Hart, ca. 6. divi. 3. Eraſm. in prefat. Ierom de ſacris ſcript. in Seneca. Euſeb l. 1. ca. 14. Ireneus l. 2. c. 39. Pareus on Rom. 16.

Epist. 1. Sibrand. lib 4. ca. 4. de Papa Rom.

at 50 yeares of age, which errour all the Elders of Asia beleeved. *Ignatius* telleth that *Mary* was at Rome with Pope *Anacletus*. If all the fables beleeved and related of the Fathers were gatherd together, it would not seeme vnlikely, that they should beleeve this fable for a trueth. Thirdly, the Scripture and reasons formerly alledged, shew that it is altogether vnlikely that *Peter* was ever at Rome. Fourthly, the great discord in writing heereof telleth vs that it is not vnlikely that they be deceived, for disagreeing witnesses haue ever beene suspected, and not easily allowed of the wise for true witnesses, but rejected rather as false. The Scripture telleth vs, that the high Priests, Scribes and Pharisees, and Elders of the people, though they sought witnesses against Iesus Christ, and found many, yet they allowed not of them, till they did agree. Fiftly, their omitting of circumstances to tell with whom hee went; for *Paul* never went without some to accompany him, and so thinke of *Peter*, what way, thorow what city, and by what means, also their grosse errings in such as they doe set downe, telleth vs, that it is not vnlikely that they haue erred heerein. For as the setting downe of necessary circumstances concurring, maketh a story credible, so doth the omission thereof, and the much varying therein, and some falshood withall make a relation smell of a lye. Sixtly, who can not but thinke it most likely, that these heerein haue erred, all the promises before well weighed, when they consider that Poperie is a mysterie of iniquitie, the Authour thereof Sathan, whose fraude (as saith *Pareus*) the Fathers did not obserue in telling of this tale, which no doubt he suggested into the first Relater, and then by others credulitie, cunningly brought it into credit. For Sathan knew what advantage this bringing of *Peter* to Rome, wold be to the Popes supremacy; & therfore he set some on worke to invent it, & the Lord did leaue others to beleeve it, and to relate it for truth, that so hee might accomplish his determined will, and fulfill his word spoken of that place and person in 2 Thess. 2. and in the Revelation, chap. 9. 11. 13. 14. 17. 18. and 19. As many waies

Comment. on Rom. cap. 16.

but

but yet Ignorantly, the Fathers made way for the Popes prince-like prelacie, so very much by this fable of *Peters* being at Rome. Seuenthly, what should make any man to thinke it vnlikely that they haue erred, though they be many, learned and godly, seeing they follow not the Scripture, not solid reason, not any approved witnesse, but a silly, seduced, fabulous Author *Papias* before spoken of, who first broached this, not from any sight he had of *Peter* at Rome, or from the mouth of any of the Apostles, whom, as himself confesseth, he never saw, but from his owne commenting braine, vpon the 1 Pet. 5. 13. of which also before. Now this man being seduced, of what credit can the rest bee which follow him? *Euseb. l. 3. ca. 35.*

P. *Verily of none at all in that thing. For all such witnesses are no farther true, then hee speaketh trueth of whom they doe receiue it. If he was deceiued, they are all deceiued.*

O. Therefore are we not to regard the many following testimonies, be they never so learned and godly, if they can say nothing of themselues, if they be but bare relaters of a report from another, without due examination and tryall of the truth. The iudgement, the learning, the honestie and credit of the first Author is to be stood vpon.

P. *You say very true, for the mustering vp of so many followers, are but as so many ciphers, which onely serue to make vp a number, but are in themselues of no value, because they speake not from themselues, but from another. But now, what of* Papias *was not the first?*

O. Whitaker and *Rainolds* vrge him as the very first vpon our aduersaries, and *Baronius* in his Catalogue of his Authors, for this can goe no higher, neither doe the aduersaries deny it to be true; as yet they haue not found a more ancient nor a better father for this fable. Papias the first author of this tale.

P. *Well, though he be the first, and but a silly man, yet being an hearer of* Iohn, *and the companion of* Polycarpus, *as* Ireneus *witnesseth, and as* Bellarmine *vrgeth him for the more credit he might speake the truth heerein, as well, as a wiser man, being onely a matter* de facto.

O. A man of little wit and iudgment may sometime tell a true tale; but what wise men will relye vpon his relation without further examination? As for that which *Irenæus* speaketh of him, it is that, as *Eusebius* reporteth, which *Papias* denyeth of himselfe, to wit, that he neither heard nor saw the Apostles. Is it not strange that such a one as *Irenæus* should write that of *Papias*, which *Papias* himselfe denyeth, and avoucheth the cleane contrary? Doth not this very thing tell vs, that the ancient Fathers may in matter *de facto*, tell vs some tales? Why then should we beleeue bare affirmations of theirs against many reasons? But what if *Papias* had bin *Iohns* hearer? must it follow, that therefore all which he telleth vs is true of S. *Peter*? Consider that *Iohn* lived after all the Apostles a long time, and therefore though he both saw and heard *Iohn*, yet might he never see *Peter*.

Euseb. l. 3. c. 35. Papias no scholler of the Apostles.

P. You say right; but they will say that Papias *might heare* Iohn *speake of* Peters *being at Rome, and so relate it from him.*

O. What *Papias* might heare is one thing, and what he did heare is an other: hee relateth no such thing from Saint *Iohn*, neither could he, for that he never heard him, but himselfe found *Peter* at Rome, as truely as he did finde Rome in Babylon out of 1 Pet. 5. 13. for which ground of strengthening the Popes supremacie, the grand *Papa* of Rome, oweth a Holy-day to S. *Papias* his wise patrone, without whom, *Peters* being at Rome had never bin heard of, who was first Sathans seeded-man to sowe this errour, to further the mysterie of iniquity, which, as *Iohn* saith, begone then in his time to worke.

P. *Sir, I thanke you for this paines, you haue satisfied me in this point to the full; the truth shall ever prevaile with me, before all pretences of Antiquity without good reason, let the authority of man be what it may be. But before I conclude with you in this point, I would know one thing, which I pray you resolue me in; what is the cause, why men not onely of weake apprehension and of the meaner sort, but also such grave & great learned men, as these of whom we haue spoken, come to be so deceiued*

ceived and lead into errours? This I propound for mine owne instruction, that I may take heed of that which may bring mee either to be an Author, or a receiuer of an vntruth.

O. Your question is not vnseasonable nor vnprofitable for a conclusion of this our conference. I take it that men fall into this errour thus. First, thorough the pride that is in mans heart, for God will teach the humble his way. 2. The want of true loue of the truth, the which maketh the Lord giue such over to beleeue lyes. 3. The deceitfull & powerfull working of Sathan in some, in whom he is a lying spirit, and by whom he will broach vntruths, and draw on others to beleeue them, for the advancement of his kingdome. 4. Hastie receiving of that which is related, and so beleeving and publishing of it for truth, before it be examined throughly. 5. By a too confident perswasion of the relaters honestie, wisdome, learning and godlinesse, taking it for granted, that if such speake it, it must needes bee true, as if such might not mistake, nor ever be deceived. 6. By taking a common report or saying to be so, because all men generally say so. 7. The Lords leaving men to their owne weakenesse heerein, to effect what in his secret counsell he hath determined.

How men come to beleeue fabulous tales, and to tell them for truth.

P. *These me thinke, leade me to see plainely how these godly men came to beleeue and publish this tale of* Peters *being at Rome, which I verily am perswaded now he neuer saw, neither euer came there, after he was called to be an Apostle.*

O. You then are fully of my minde.

P. *Yes verily, and euer will be, except your reasons can bee soundly confuted, and better reasons be brought to proue* Peters *being at Rome, than those foolish, ridiculous, and very childish arguments of* Bellarmine *be, which I think will hardly be done: and so (deare friend* Orthologus*) for this time I will take leaue, and kindly bid you farewell.*

O. Till our next meeting, farewell (my good friend *Philalethes*) and I pray you commend me to all yours and my friends, the true louers of the truth, and warily take heed of that erroneous and common Christian *Pseudodoxie*, and keepe

keepe your selfe from that obstinate enemy of ours *Pseudo-catholicus*, that eager persecuting Papist. Let vs both embrace the godly and fatherly counsell of *Theodidactus*, and ever be advised by him, if our hap be at any time, to haue to doe with either of these.

P. *I will not be forgetfull of this your good counsell and friendly fore-warning, for which, and all this your paines taken with me, I hartily thanke you, and so againe, the Lord bee with you, and giue you good rest.*

O. The Lord be with you also, and with all the true louers of the Gospell of our Lord Iesus Christ vnto the day of his glorious appearing for our eternall deliverance.

P. *Amen, Amen.*

TOVCHING

TOVCHING THIS ANNEXED CHRONOGRAPHICALL description of PAVLS peregrination, three things are to *bee obserued.*

FIrst, That *Pauls* life is, after his conversion, extended too farre in the common account vnto the last of *Nero* the 14 of his reigne, by which account his conversion being *Anno Christi* 35. (as most hold) and as the truth of Scripture will teach them, and he suffering in the 14 of *Nero*, his yeares come to 37, which *Bellarmine* gladly taketh advantage of for to further the tale of *Peters* being at Rome 25 yeares, after he had beene at Antioch 7. and in Iewrie 5. as he reckoneth them. But *Baronius* maketh it impossible that *Peter* and *Pauls* martyrdome should fall out in the 14. and therefore he concludeth it in the 13, and reiecteth the other, and also *Epiphanius* opinion, who holdeth it to be in the 12 of *Nero*. Which of the three is the nigheſt vnto the truth, will appeare in this ensuing Chronologie, and by the truth of this next point heere to be obserued.

Secondly, That the Acts of the Apostles, written by Saint *Luke* comprehend the yeares of saint *Pauls* life. Now the history of the Acts extendeth not to aboue the 34 yeare of *Pauls* conversion; for after the end of the two yeares mentioned in Acts 28.30. followed the death of *Paul*, who came not to Rome so soone in the 2 of *Nero*, as many imagine, nor yet in the 4, as others hold, but in the 9 or 10 of *Nero*; for *Paul* pleaded before *Felix* in or about the 7 of *Nero*, and

then was hee two yeares and more in Cesarea, before hee was sent to Rome, and some 5 or 6 moneths were spent in going to Rome, and then he was two yeares in his owne house, so as the end thereof must reach to the 33 of *Paul*, & to the 12 of *Nero*. And it is held that the Epistles that *Paul* wrote from Rome, were written within this two yeares space, except the last to *Timothie*, which was written betweene his first and last appearing before *Nero*, at which time *Timothie* was absent. But when *Paul* wrote to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, hee was with him at Rome. Now this Epistle might be written immediately vpon the end of the two yeares when *Paul* was called before *Nero*: for it could not be long, but shortly after that Saint *Paul* had written to the Ephesians, at which time *Timothy* was gone from Rome, to whom he telleth of his sending of *Tychicus* to the Ephesians with his letter, in which Coast *Timothy* seemeth then to be; this could be no long time between. For this telling of sending *Tychicus* implyeth (it being within the two yeares) that it was but a little before this second Epistle to *Timothy*, which was shortly before Saint *Pauls* death, euen in the same Sommer in which he was martyred. For if *Baronius* say true, that *Paul* suffered in the 3. of the Calends of Iuly, then was this Epistle written; for it was but a little before his death, it was also in Sommer, and by the former account in the 12 of *Nero*. And further wee know, that *Luke* wrote the Acts, that he was a companion of the Apostles in his travell to Rome; (for he saith *wee* and *vs* often as including himselfe) and that he was with *Paul* at Rome, and there abode with him vnto this time. Now we may well thinke, that hee writing the story of the Apostle, would goe as farre as he could, except the mentioning of his death; for when hee saith that *Paul* had libertie to preach two yeares, it may be gathered, that after that time ended, followed his last sufferings and martyrdome, for els he would haue named moe yeares of his libertie, if moe had beene. But heere it may bee demanded, if *Luke* knew of

2 Timo.4.16.

Eph.6.21.
2 Tim.4.12.
14.15.

2 Tim.4 6.7.
21.

Act 27.1.2.4.
& 28 2.10.
2 Tim 4.11.

Paul

Pauls troubles & death, why did he not ſet the ſame down alſo? I take the reaſon to be this, becauſe he would not ſeeme to taxe *Nero* that Tyrant and perſecutour, nor the Romanes, who then did ſway the world, leſt theſe heathen enemies of the Goſpell ſhould come by his hiſtory, and finding themſelues taxed therein, ſhould be the more enraged againſt Chriſtians. This was not onely *Lukes* warineſſe, but S. *Pauls* in ſpeaking of the then Romane Emperours or Empire, 2 Theſſ. 2.5. and 6 verſes: ſo of *Nero*, 2 Tim. 4.17. of whom he ſpeaketh covertly. And S. *Iohn* dealeth thus warily in Rev. 1.9. telling of his being in Patmos for the word of God, but not a ſyllable of his baniſhment in plaineneſſe of ſpeach; and this may we obſerue in *Luke*, that albeit hee nameth now and then the Romane Magiſtrates, yet he dealeth very warily; if any good in them, he commendeth it; if any thing of their euils towards the Saints, it is moſt cautelouſly. Hence alſo it is, that there is not mention made of any one put to death by any Romane authority; but onely by and among the Iewes, as of the death of *Stephen* and of *Iames* the Lords brother, of which *Luke* ſpeaketh freely and plainely. Laſtly, if we doe account the yeares of Saint *Paul* from the 19 of *Tiberius*, to the 12. of *Nero*, in which ſaith *Epiphanius*, *Paul* ſuffered, and when he ſuffered, Papiſts ſay, *Peter* ſuffered, wee ſhall finde, that the hiſtory of the Acts will make them vp to the full, as I haue ſhewed in the Chronographicall deſcription.

Why Luke wrote not of Pauls death.

Thirdly, That Paul after hee came to Rome was ever a priſoner vnto his death, and never ſet at libertie againe. For neither *Luke*, nor *Paul* himſelfe maketh any where mention of his departure from Rome after he came to Rome; but we finde that in his Epiſtles hee nameth his impriſonment and bands continually; we alſo may ſee how hee ſent others into theſe parts of *Aſia*, and the regions thereaway where he had beene, as *Timothie* to the Philippians, *Tychicus* to the Epheſians, and with him *Oneſimus* to the Coloſſians, & that but a little before his death, when he alſo wrote vnto *Timothie*

Eph 3.1.& 41. & 6.20. Phil. 1. 13. Col. 4.10. 18. Philem. 10. 23. 2. Tim. 18. 16. Phil. 2.19.23.

thie in that his abſence from him in thoſe coaſts, as before is noted. And if the end of the two yeares of his abode at Rome be the beginning of the yeare of his martyrdome next and immediatly following, then was hee not freed after his comming to Rome. But againſt this it will be obiected.

Firſt Obiect, 1. *Tim.* 4. 17. There hee ſaith that at his firſt anſwer the Lord deliuered him out of the mouth of the Lion, therefore was he ſet at libertie. I anſwer, that *deliuerance* here is not meant freedome from bonds, but his eſcaping of preſent death, as the phraſe, *out of the mouth of the Lion*, agaping vpon him ready to devoure him, doth ſhewe; and it is meant of a deliuerance from ſuch a danger as made all to forſake him, even the appearance of inevitable death before their eies, elſe could not all of them haue beene ſtroken into ſuch dreadfull feare, as to make them all to forſake the Apoſtle in that perill.

Second Obiect. *Philip.* 1. 25. 26. & 2. 24. Where the Apoſtles words implyeth his comming againe to the Philippians, for he truſted in the Lord to come to them. I anſwere that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not of certaintie, but as one in hope, truſting, that is, relying vpon the Lord for his deliuerance, who could deliuer him, if he were ſo pleaſed; But S. Paul could not ſpeake of certaintie I ſay; for hee himſelfe ſpeaketh of himſelfe, evē then, as not knowing what ſhould become of him. cap. 2. 23. and was yet in bonds. cap. 1. 13. So he writeth to *Philemon*, verſ. 22. that he truſteth through their prayers, that he ſhall be giuen vnto them; will it therefore follow that he did goe againe vnto them? If he did not, you will ſay that then the Apoſtle was deceaued. What of that? This impaired not his credit or authoritie, being not in a matter of faith and doctrine, but in a thing contingent and future, and a matter of no more waight than this, and wherein he relied vpon the Lords good pleaſure, of which hee could haue no certaintie, but by an heavenly revelation, which in this caſe was not neceſſarie, neither had he for it any revelation: for then, why did he not ſend *Timothie* as hee purpoſed.

Calvin. on Phil. 1. 25.

purposed, if he had beene certaine from the Lord of his deliverance, but would stay him with him till he might know *what would become of him?* Which telleth vs plainely, that his knowledge was by no revelation from God, but depended vpon the future events as God should dispose of the will of man, to wit, *Nero*, before whom, hee was to make his appearance. Phil. 2. 23. 24.

Third Obiect. Many doe say that he was set at libertie, & so went into *Macedonia*, *Asia*, *Syria*, and after was taken of *Nero* the second time and imprisoned and after put to death. I answer. 1. that it is said but not proued. 2. If it had beene so, how commeth it to passe that *Luke* vndertaking to write the Acts of S. Paule; would omit this his deliuerance, seeing also that he lined to his death? 3. *Baronius* is so vncertaine hereof, as he could not, as he saith, safely affirme it. *Annal. Christ. 61 Petri. 7. num. 1.* 4. This is raised vpon this imagination, that *Paul* came to Rome in the second of *Nero*, and abiding in his hired house two yeares, there remained, as they supposed, 10 yeares of *Nero* his raigne, al which time, because they could not find him at Rome, they then haue deuised where hee might bee, Some haue conceited in *Italy*, and *Spaine*, others in those Easterne Countries, in which he had beene, weakly gathering it out of the place of the Philippians; but *Paul* had no such time of life remaining after the two yeares in Rome mentioned *Act.* 28. 30. to passe away so far again frō Rome, and then to returne in the twelfth of *Nero*, as they say, to a second imprisonment: if ten yeares had remained. Can we I say, imagine that *Luke* would haue wholy in silence passed them ouer? would he haue beene so curious in setting down some where two yeares, three yeares, one yeare, a yeare and six months, three months, yea seauen daies, and fiue daies, & one, as he doth in the Acts, and leaue off to mention whole tenne yeares space? It seemeth to mee no way probable. Lastly this conceit of *Pauls* going againe into those regions of the East where he was before is cōtrarie to the words of S. *Paul* himselfe, who thus said to them, when hee tooke

his farewell of them. *Now beloued, I knowe that yee all among whom I haue gone preaching the kingdome of God, shall see my face no more.* This he vttereth with *I knowe*, and with *Behold*, as a thing certainely knowne vnto him; and therefore we may well thinke this last peregrination of S. *Paul* from Rome and to Rome againe is but a conceit, as is the fable of *Peter's* being at Rome.

Act. 20. 25.

* * *

FINIS.

A SVRVEY OF THE POPES SVPREMACIE:

Wherein is a triall of [illegible] and a proofe of [illegible] practises; and [illegible] rhetoricate argument [illegible] hath, [illegible]

[illegible]

By FRANCIS BVNNY sometime fellow of Magdalene Colledge in Oxford.

Hos. 8. 4.

They have set vp a king but not by me, they [illegible] knew it not.

AT LONDON,
Printed by Valentine Simmes for Rafe Iacson dwelling in Paules *Churchyard at the signe of* the white Swan.
1595.